National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. Without Concealment:...Without Compromise. EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } Corresponding Editors.

VOL. XI....NO. 16. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1850. WHOLE NO. 536.

Published Weekly, BY THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY AT 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.

TERMS: TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. Gay, New York.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. Gay, New York.

Norris & Brother, Printers

Selections.

SPEECH OF MR. BROOKS

ON THE WILMOT PROVISO.

U. S. House of Representatives, August 25th, 1850.

The Bill for the adjustment of the Texas Boundary was under consideration. Mr. Boyd of Ky. had moved to amend, by incorporating with it the Bills to establish Territorial governments for New Mexico and Utah. A further amendment had been moved by Mr, Clingman of N. C. to erect a new Territory out of that portion of California and New Mexico lying South of latitude 36 30, to be called Colorado. Mr. Burt of S. C. then moved to refer the Bill to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union. Mr. Root (Soil) of Ohio moved to amend this motion by adding—

"With instructions so to amend the bill as to exclude Slavery from all the territory acquired from Mexico by the treaty of Gaudalupe Hidalgo, lying eastward of California."

After some remarks by Mr. McClernand of Illinois, Mr. Brooks, (editor of *The New York Express*,) rose and said—

That he was opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio, and he rose to make some remarks in opposition to it. He had been ready at any time "to face that gentleman's music," and he "faced it" the first of the session, and he was more ready "to face it" now. The world had rolled round, and the sticks of the gentleman's drum had been kept beating—but in the revolution of the earth, the fewer the soldiers that obeyed the gentleman's *tattoo*. If he kept on beating much longer, the fact was, as he believed, that very few would pay attention either to his morning or his evening drum. As for himself, he could say, it had not beat loud enough, or fierce enough yet, to alarm his nerves. He faced it now. He should vote against his proviso—had voted against it in January last, and was ready to vote against it in all the Januaries to come.

There was a time (Mr. B. went on to say) when the Wilmot proviso was not as it is now, a mere useless, mischievous abstraction, and he could very well understand the motives and the reasons of gentlemen who voted against it. It was a bolt, however, that had done its errand, that had discharged its duties, and the spent bolt now, that some men were for hurling, could only do mischief and create unnecessary alarm. When the Wilmot proviso was first introduced and passed on the floor of this House, it taught the country two salutary and important lessons, the South first, that the war with Mexico could not go on to extend Slavery, but that the intent and purpose would be by the majority resisted, and it taught the North next, that conquest and extension of territory jeopardied the very existence of the Union. The fear of the Wilmot Proviso predisposed the Southern Democratic party for peace, and it alarmed the Democracy of the North not only for the Union itself, but for the nationality, and even existence of their party. Thus Democrats coöperated with Whigs in arresting the career of our Generals in Mexico, and in compelling a peace.

The lesson is impressed upon our history; and no party, hereafter, will be anxious for a war of conquest, unless it is first settled to which section of the Union the political profit will accrue. The reasons and motives then that prompted gentlemen to urge the Wilmot Proviso, no doubt sprang from high and patriotic causes; but as things were now, the Wilmot proviso was an abstraction, mischievous in all its consequences, and periling even the unity and existence of the Republic. That Providence of Almighty God, which had so often watched over and preserved us as a favored people, with His "cloud by day and pillar of fire by night," is watching over us now, and preserving us now, from the perils that our passion for conquest and for other peoples' lands, had brought upon us. We were to be preserved, too, without any self-sacrifices of principle, or pride, or sectional preferences, or pledges, if we would only leave all that to Almighty God, and not attempt to be wiser than He, in settling the destiny of our country; what part of it should be bond or free. The destiny is already fixed, irrevocably fixed, beyond any human control; and, in my opinion, all we ought to try to do, is to await the decree of that Providence, and stand by it, whatever it may be.

To settle this terrible agitation in this Hall and Chamber, such by the way as no other form of government is strong enough to stand a month, I am willing to become a convert to the doctrine of non-intervention, of non-action—and in good faith too. If it is of any importance to know what I am willing to do, I will state here, that I will vote for no Wilmot proviso, now or hereafter, on any matters before us; and I will stand upon the principle, that the authority of this Government shall not be exerted to exclude or to extend Slavery, the principle of compromise upon which it was framed. Thus it will be seen, if I am opposed to a single-headed, uniform, universal Wilmot, I am the more opposed to the double-headed, doubled shotted Wilmot, which would *exclude* Slavery by law north of 36 30, and *establish* it by law south of that line. If the Wilmot proviso is a principle, and a principle that must be enforced, the law of the majority will succeed, and the old, and ancient, and venerable, and now immortal "Wilmot" will carry the day.

But I will pledge myself here now, while a member of this Congress, to resist them both; and I will fall back, in order to give peace, upon the non-intervention, non-action invitation of the southern members, so fervently sent up during the last Congress in these Halls, and I beg these gentlemen here to stand the ground they stood on then, and not to become converts to the Wilmot principle which they once so earnestly denounced, and which is without doubt a principle alarming to the South. I will stand with them now on their principle of non-intervention, and I will follow the salutary rule, that the Federal Government was not created to exclude or establish Slavery by law, and leave that exciting subject to the States, and the inscrutable Providence that has fixed so anomalous a class of human beings upon our otherwise free form of government. No other rule of action, as it now seems to me, can save this glorious heritage of our fathers from the inevitable internal dissensions which threaten it—and these were the rules which animated and inspired the bosoms of the Hancocks, the Rutledges, the Adamses, and the Pinckneys, and who bequeathed this heritage to us.

And I can see, Mr. Speaker, that no section of our country has anything to lose, but on the contrary, everything to gain by the policy of non-action in this matter of Slavery, for that destiny of Almighty God, of which I spoke but a moment ago, has regulated all these things for us. California is settled, and is settling with a miraculous rapidity: and its social polity is fixed beyond the power of this Government to change it. No law of yours is omnipotent enough to reverse the social order there established. The people have decreed and are yet decreeing the universality of freedom. The emigrant from the banks of the Mississippi joins heartily with the emigrant from Maine, in ordaining the exclusion of Slavery, as the common interest of all; and all the armies and navies of the world cannot create Slavery where all the people *will* all to be free.

I know that southern gentlemen attribute this feeling to the pre-occupation of the soil by northern emigrants, under the patronage of the Federal Government; but a power higher than any government settled this question; and that was gold, stimulating instant, tumultuous emigration. The columns of emigration settled, as they always will under like circumstances, the establishment or exclusion of Slavery. The steamship, the winds that wafted northern commerce there, settled the question. The people of the North did not so much go, as rush to fly, to California, when they heard that gold was there,—and the poor white man of the South, who could raise money enough to go, was there, before the owners of negroes could prepare themselves to start. California became the magnet, which attracted all the enterprising poverty of America. The northern rich capitalist reposed upon his funds at home, and so did the planter on his plantation at the South, but the enterprising and ambitious poverty of both sections, rushed, aye flew on the wings of the wind, to California, and established an *equality* there to have which they left their own land. No overland emigration from the slave States could overtake, or over-match these crusaders after the golden fleece. Poverty was behind, and gold was before,—and when the winds blew not strong enough, or fast enough, the genius of steam was evoked to hurry them on. The world has never seen anything like this eruption, or irruption, not even in the days of the Crusaders.

How idle, then, amid such a whirlwind of causes and of people, to impute to the distant and feeble powers at Washington, a potency enough to restrain the establishment of Slavery there! The white man there would not work with the negro in the mines, and that settled the question. The white man would not allow the capitalist, be he owner of negroes, or of peons, or of other property, to scrape, scratch, or shovel more gold than he could—and that settled the question. It was a question between labor present and capital absent, and labor instantly prevailed. The southern emigrant joins with the northern, the first from interest, the second from education and prepossession. No authority of government could establish Slavery among such a class of emigrants. The Executive, the Legislative, and Judicial powers of this Government combined, have never been able to do it, and cannot do it now. It would be easier this moment to establish Slavery in the older States of the North; where great social and pecuniary inequalities, perchance, exist; but the thing is utterly impossible among a people who have fled from wealth, and its inequalities, in order to be socially, morally, politically, and so to speak, pecuniarily, equal and free.

Gentlemen from the South, who acknowledge in their hearts, if not by word of mouth, these truths, seek to reverse them by dividing California, making of one part a State, and of another a Territory. If I were to consult only the free soil passion of the day, and to vote with especial reference to my section on that point, I should certainly second, instead of resisting that movement; for these same causes, which have made California non-slaveholding, will ever continue, until heavy, massive columns of slave emigration overland, can overtake and overrun emigration by sea, or the now, cheap, quick-moving, enterprising emigration from the northwest. We are as certain to have two free States, it seems clear to me, as we were to have one, if California is divided; and the more gold that is found in the southern part, the greater and quicker will be the rush of the flying columns of emigration there, that will not work with slaves or allow a master of slaves to amass unequal shares of the precious dust. So that Slavery, as it seems to me, is as clearly and as certainly shut out from the Pacific as it is from Canada, on the northern part of the Atlantic coast. The great and impressive motive I have in resisting the division of California, comes from the great danger of being, some day or other, ruled by the members in the Senate from our Mexican acquisitions. As a resident of an Atlantic State, I do not want my people to be outnumbered, out-represented, out-voted in the United States Senate. I do not want the Atlantic ocean to bow down to the Pacific. When I look upon the map, and survey the almost immeasurable regions we have now on the Pacific, and west of the sources of the Missouri, I foresee that New England, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and the Southern States, are shorn of their sovereignty in the Union. I wish to do all I can to avert that result—I wish to make of California, of Utah, of Oregon, of New Mexico, of Nebraska, States as large as possible. I go for the broadest extent of latitude and longitude compatible with their geographical positions, and the public interest. Large States, it is for the interest of us in these now thirty States, to carve out of those to come; aye, the very largest, unless we intend to be overwhelmed in the Senate. Hence, I wish to resist the division of California, and I rather sorrow that she has not taken more than she claims. To divide her, it thus seems to me is a common injury to the North and the South, to be aggravated to the South, if what seems to be certain, follows, viz: the establishment of two free States there, instead of one. Even if we go further, and establish Slavery by law in one of these California States, as some gentlemen seem to desire, and thus ordain a Southern Wilmot proviso in their behalf, it would be the same as attempting to establish Slavery in Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania or Ohio: for these and the like people are already there, and practical masters of that soil. And this is what I meant, when I spoke of destiny, the decrees of Providence, or the fiat of Almighty God. The question, I say, is settled, and all man can do, is by unnecessary agitation to sow the seeds of civil war, and to make unhappy and bloody the soil on which we dwell.

The gentleman from Ohio is, however, not satisfied with that decree of Providence; and as he seems to think Providence has not done enough for our section of the Union, *he* will do something more. He asks us to face the music as an abstraction of his, and he tauntingly tells us he will "smoke the doughfaces out." He renews here to-day a proposition that he introduced at the early part of the session—an abstraction, which attempted to exclude Slavery by law when governments were established in all of our Mexican acquisitions, including California.

Mr. Root. No, not California.

Mr. Brooks. Well, in all our Territories east of California. And that abstraction was once thrust out of the House, amid all the cries of the gentleman upon us northern members "to face the music." I trust that this unnecessary, inopportune, and mischievous proposition will receive the same kind of treatment now, though it presents itself in a more imposing form. I know, and I feel the power which the gentleman's whip may have over members elected two years ago in the storm of Anti-Slavery excitement that then existed; and I know the embarrassment that whip may create amid members pledged during that excitement to vote as he who sets himself up to be their overseer, their driver, tells them to do. But the day of overseers and of drivers is passing away, and the whip is losing its lash. Emancipation is every day coming more and more, as the world rolls round, and the less are we slaves, fearing our would-be masters. Emancipation, however, cannot thoroughly take place, till the people pass their Representatives through the ordeal of another election. Two years ago, Mr. Clay, our favorite candidate for the Presidency, was sacrificed, as we Whigs of the north in the main believed, because of his liberal preferences, and General Taylor was made our candidate for the Presidency for an opposite cause. The indignation over such a sacrifice drove no small portion of our party into extremes, and these extremes were invigorated by the fuel which the Free Soil Van Buren Democracy supplied. The members of this Congress from the free States were elected, in the main, amid this excitement, and they came here under impulses, and with pledges from which there can be no escape only by the ordeal of another election. When that takes place, they will represent a people who, in my belief, share in but a small degree, with the extremes now acting upon this floor. The people are ahead of their Representatives, I feel sure, in a disposition to settle all these agitating questions before us, which now divide and distract the country, and to settle them amicably, fraternally and equally. As to my own self I can say, that though I took great responsibility in voting against the Wilmot Proviso the early part of this session, I have been more than sustained in the great metropolis which I have the honor in part to represent. Over forty thousand names, not many of ink and paper, but real men with residences to their names, have given me and my colleague a right to ride in an omnibus, a cab, a sulky, a wagon or a cart, aye in any honorable vehicle that comes to us singly or doubly, but to ride at all events. I prefer a carriage with a single passenger, if I can get it, but I shall not stand upon the order of my going, but keep trying to go. And this feeling is not alone my feeling of the city. The great metropolis of the nation's commerce, the centre of its business, the heart of its exchanges, but foreshadows what the nation thinks. It may be in advance of the nation. Public opinion may there sooner come to a head, but when the business agents of a nation—when its servants speak, and speak thus emphatically, unanimously, and nearly unanimously, it is but a prelude to the note of the loud thunder that is preparing to burst.

The gentleman from Ohio, I think, foresees the coming public opinion in the North, and hence his musical blast again this morning to summon his followers to overawe us of the North, and to frighten us down. "Othello's occupation's gone," if the excitement is not kept brewing. What will become of me, perchance he soliloquizes, if the storm is hushed, and I am not buoyed up, and I drop down? If, in the importance and grandeur of the subject which we have this day and yesterday voted upon, there was not a solemnity that did not admit of the ridiculous, the extraordinary scenes and associations of to-day and yesterday would convulse us with laughter. I saw marching between the tellers just now, almost arm in arm, and more than once, gentlemen from the North and South, who could hardly keep each other's company two seconds without a smile or a shrug. There went the gentleman from Ohio, and gentleman from South Carolina, Siamese Twins. They were there gentlemen together who were for dissolving the Union if the Wilmot Proviso *was* passed, and gentlemen for dissolving the Union if it was *not* passed. Gentlemen will pardon me, but some lines of Shakspeare run through my head, and I must let them out, in order to describe this composition:—

> "Fillet of the fenny snake,
> In the cauldron broil and bake:
> Eye of newt, and toe of frog,
> Wool of bat, and tongue of dog,
> Adder's fork, and blindworm's sting,
> Lizard's leg, and owlet's wing.
> For a charm of powerful trouble,
> Like a hell-broth boil and bubble.
> Double, double, toil and trouble;
> Fire, burn, and, cauldron bubble!"

And so this cauldron is to be made to broil and bubble from all parts of this Union. Now the amazing fraternity, this almost ludicrous combination may be very patriotic on the part of gentlemen from sections of the Union, and from parties utterly opposite; it may be from nobler motives than those which the people impute. And to worthy motives I am willing to impute, nay, I am bound to impute (it would be unparliamentary to do otherwise) all actions upon this floor, but not the less can I keep my eye from this strange, this extraordinary junction of extremes, this droll consociation of bedfellows, who meet but to kiss, then to snarl, to bark, and to bite. If anything, however, on earth were wanting to convince me that I am right, it would be the opposition of these extremes to my course of action. If anything were wanting to convince me that the people of this country were at heart in favor of the principle of action which I wish to carry out on this floor, it would be the combination of extremes in opposition to these principles. I repeat, then, I have no doubt in my mind that the great body of the Southern people are willing "to face the music" at any time whenever the sound of the drum reaches their ears, even if their Representatives from opposite pledges and opposite associations are not ready to face it here in this House.

The great white race of this country, neither North nor South, will never long consent to peril, much less to lend this Union on account of the African; and he who calculates to win popular favor, or to make a name beyond his own barn-door, by any vociferation of any obstreperous character, about the African, be he from the North or from the South, much mistakes the genius of our countrymen. A member may crow himself into Congress, but he will only tarry there until some louder cock outcrows him. Whenever it is really felt that the Union is in peril from the excess of zeal for the African, North or South, the white race, for self-preservation, for its own liberty, life, law, will rise as the winds rise, and the howl of the hurricane will be so terrible, that poor chanticleer will skulk from the storm, and pray for the dunghill to fall on and hide him. Our countrymen are so proud of their country—it is such an honor to be an American citizen; the destiny of our Union is believed to be so bright and glorious, that the white man will not sacrifice himself for the African. We owe him duties, the greater for the depression in which we keep him, and infamy alight upon him, whoever, anywhere, oppresses the African in the comforts of life, the consolations of religion, or in the rupture of the social ties that consecrate a home; but woe, woe, be to the man, who rends the Union to extend Slavery, or to enforce its exclusion by violent, unnecessary, provoking laws. Many sacrifices will be made, and ever have been made by all parties, to create and to maintain this Union; and these sacrifices must ever continue to be made. The great body of the Northern people stand ready to make their share of the sacrifice, and among them, as I believe the Wilmot Proviso men; but they expect like sacrifices on the part of their Southern countrymen. Whoever asks must give; and when any one of us offers to surrender our prejudices and preferences that the North has had, and yet has, for the Proviso, me cannot understand the patriotism of the Southern man, who asks us to establish one for him. These mutual surrenders of interests and of preferences alone can carry this Government on. And as a Government, it ceases to be useful or practical, as for nine months it has been in this Hall, if there is to be an eternal conflict among the white race here, about the black race elsewhere.

This Government is, in my opinion, the strongest Government on earth, as long as it attends to the duties imposed upon it by the Constitution, and refrains from agitating topics its framers would not even name, much more agitate, and reagitate upon. A dissolution of the Union, therefore, I look upon as impossible. The despotism of Russia, or the Democracy of France in its wildest paroxysms, could never rally stouter hands or warmer hearts, to protect, defend, and maintain order and law, and to put down conspiracy or treason. The loyalty to the Union is of love, affection, of a common glorious life, and a coming brighter future,—and such a Government no conspirators, no traitors can overthrow. I apprehend, therefore, no physical dissolution of this Union. I hear the threats, and the mutterings, but their impotency amuses as often as their audacity provokes. But there is a moral, a social dissolution of the Union, that I fear, and of which, alas! already I see signs among us. We begin to be afraid to speak aloud among one another. Brethren as we are, countrymen under the same flag, there are topics upon which we cannot talk together, and of which we can only whisper in sections among ourselves. One of the worst omens of the times is nightly sectional caucuses in these Halls, which teach us to distrust each other, and to consider a man an enemy, because he was born under a Northern or a Southern sky. These suspicions, this distrust, this rupture of our fraternal bonds, may, I sometimes fear, provoke mad men, or mad States to attempt to dissolve this Union; but if they could be successful, it would only be amid fire and blood—and to be accursed by all posterity. No sacrifice is too great for me to avert this horrible catastrophe. The Union, I doubt not, can be maintained, and must be maintained, even by arms, if necessary,—but what is a Union worth, without love, without loyalty, without pride in it, and only protected by arms? Unite us once more as brethren, restore our ancient fraternity, settle and banish from these Halls this afflicting subject of Slavery—and the Government is stronger than it it had at its service two hundred thousand serried bayonets, or whole parks of artillery.

A few words more to my northern countrymen, and I will finish these altogether unpremeditated remarks, which the sudden and unexpected apparition of the ghost of Wilmot, presented here by the gentleman from Ohio, and which I thought *laid* in January, has called out. I conjure them now to lay this ghost again—to face this music as they did in January. Now is the day, and now is the hour. And yet I do not know who constituted this or any other member musician over us, or made him drum-major, of the great northern band. Who hired him for an overseer—who put the driver's whip in his hands to crack and lay on our backs, and make us face the music he plays? Can anybody tell? I will not speak of this insolent tone, or of such insolent language, in the terms they deserve; for it is unparliamentary often to speak the truth, and to characterize such terms as they ought to be characterized.—[illegible] knowing what divine right the gentleman has to call upon us to [illegible] our hands to him, to marshal us or "to smoke out our dough faces," to quote his words. Sir, if to do right and to *dare* to do right—if to stand by my own white face first, and the African next—if to utter such sentiments as I have been uttering, and to act upon them, make me a doughface, my face is all dough, and the gentleman may make the most he can of the admission. I am ready to be smoked out, and have been for nine months, and the quicker the smoking the better, for I am heartily tired of staying in this hole here. I want to breathe the free air of the people once more, and to be relieved from the stifling and confusing sentiment that assumes to speak for the people here.

The proposition of the gentleman from Ohio, now, that he drums us northern men up to, is the exclusion of Slavery by law from Utah; for I take it for granted, that if he considers California safe, New Mexico is considered safe for exactly a similir reason. Well, it is of the highest importance to exclude Slavery, by law, from Deseret, from Utah, from the Mormon settlements there! O, don't waste a moment, for there is an imminent danger least the planter may desert the rich bottom lands of the Mississippi, and Alabama, and of the Santee and Pedee, and rush, with his slaves from the cotton and sugar temptations of Texas, through the desert, over the snowy mountains, to the great Salt Lake in Utah. If there ever was any danger of the extension of Slavery in our Mexican acquisitions, it was that it would go to the shores of the Pacific, where no proviso is now proposed by the gentleman from Ohio. Not that it would prevail among the Mormons, who, as a mass, abhor Slavery almost with a religious fanaticism—and who are emigrants, not from the slave States, but from old England, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, and the North-west, all non-slaveholding regions.—The negro can no more work for his master, and prosper in Utah, than in Canada or in Maine. It is a soil that demands irrigation; the farms are, and are intended to be, small. If Canada ever knocks at the door of the Union, I shall then expect to see the gentleman from Ohio insist that it cannot come in without his proviso in advance fixed upon it. For in the elevated regions of Utah, the frost kills the cotton in September, as it does in Canada or Maine. To insist upon the application of the Wilmot proviso to such a people, and to such a region, is but to provoke, to annoy, to excite a portion of our countrymen, "to set their tails on fire to see how they run." I will be a party to no such fun.

Mr. Campbell (imperfectly heard by the reporter) was understood to inquire of the gentleman from New York whether slaves were not now held in Utah?

Mr. Brooks. There may be a few officers of the army with their servants there, perhaps a few others. There are no doubt, in my own city just now, from eight hundred to one thousand slaves this travelling season.

Mr. Campbell. But there are some four hundred slaves already in Utah. I can state so positively, if the gentleman from New York does not know it.

Mr. Brooks. Upon what authority?

Mr Campbell. The Delgate from Utah.

Mr. Brooks. Ah! I understand all that. The Delegate from New Mexico lost his seat in consequence of alienating from him the whole South, by representing the fact that there were no slaves there and the Delegate from Utah don't intend to make any such mistake. By riding a little on both sides he will be sure to get in. Some four hundred slaves will be good for the South, and the soil and the climate, and the character of the people, will do for the North.

Mr. Stevens, of Pennsylvania, asked Mr. Brooks to allow him to put a question.

Mr. Brooks. Certainly. I love to be catechised.

Mr. Stevens. It is pleasant to ask a gentleman questions who loves to answer them. What I want to know is, if soil, climate, and Providence keep Slavery out of Utah, why they don't keep them out of New York.

Mr. Brooks. They do. When the Southern sun rages, Southern travellers bring to New York their body servants in considerable numbers; and as long as the climate is agreable they tarry, but when Utah weather comes, they are off with the first frost, as fast as the locomotive can carry them. Is the gentleman answered?

Mr. B closed his remarks by saying, that as the thread of his discourse had been broken he would yield the floor, and more especially as this was not now the time to do in proper order what he wished to do—discuss the Texas Boundary Bill.

SPEECH OF HON. DAVID WILMOT,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

In the House of Representatives, Wednesday, July 24, 1850.

The Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union having postponed the consideration of the California Message, and taken up the bill making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy—

Mr. Wilmot obtained the floor, and proceeded to say: That he should fail in his duty if he remained silent under the charge against those friendly to the unconditional admission of California, made upon them by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClernand]. He had himself heard of the existence of a party or faction in that House, so hostile to California as an independent measure as to threaten resistance by revolutionary means to paralyze the functions of Government, by a defeat of the ordinary and necessary appropriations. This faction he understood to be the allies and coadjutors of the gentleman from Illinois. He (Mr. W.) was not of them in spirit or in action.

Mr. Williams rose to a point of order. He submitted the question of the admission of California, &c.

Mr. Preston King said, that as the whole question of the freedom of debate came into controversy on this point of order, he should ask that it be reduced to writing.

Mr. Williams referred to the rule on which he based his point of order.

The point of order was then reduced to writing, as follows:

"I call the gentleman to order, under the 31st rule of the House, which requires the speaker to confine himself to the question under debate, and it is not in order for the gentleman to discuss the merits of the California bill on the question now pending."

Mr. Hilliard inquired whether the question was debateable?

The Chairman said, the Chair had not yet given a decision.

The Chairman then said that, looking to the range of debate which was allowed in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, the Chair did not feel authorized to pronounce the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Wilmot] out of order. The Chair, therefore, overruled the point of order.

Mr. Williams said, that he appealed from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. Wilmot desired to be informed by the Chair, whether, when the House was in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, the state of the Union *generally*, as well as the immediate bill which was pending, was not under consideration?

The Chairman assented, remarking that it was upon that ground that he had overruled the point of order.

The question was then taken, "Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Committee?" and decided in the affirmative, without a division.

So the decision of the Chair was *affirmed* by the Committee.

Mr. Wilmot proceeded. Not until to-day, and from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClernand], had he heard this charge of a desire to defeat the appropriation bills, made upon the friends of Freedom. He had risen to repel any such charge, and to brand as false all such rumors. Indeed, it was astonishing to him how such rumors could have obtained currency. He suspected that they existed only in the imagination of the gentleman from Illinois, and that he is the first to give them breath and circulation. In the caucus to which the gentleman refers, there was not a word said which could be tortured into such a construction. It is true that the friends of California desire action; it is true they begin to apprehend that those who came here professedly her friends, are not so in good faith, but are prepared to give her the go-by. He desired to give to California precedence over the appropriation bills. He believed that the friends of California desired that course now; and the reason is this: the history of the Government, for twenty years, proves that the appropriation bills are not passed until the last days of the session; and he felt satisfied that when those bills were passed, that the day of adjournment will have arrived: The same men who now seek to stave off the admission of California—to put the consideration of that great measure behind other business, after a shameful delay of eight months—the same men, sir, will vote for and carry an adjournment so soon as the appropriation bills shall have been passed. It is to insure action on this measure—to make it certain—to place it beyond doubt or contingency, that we desire to give it priority over the appropriation bills. The admission of California is the great measure of public interest, and ought to be first and foremost in our regards. It is uppermost in the minds and affections of the people, and should not by us be made subordinate to anything else. Judging from the declarations of gentlemen when we met here in December last, when the voices of our constituents were yet audible, he (Mr. W.) had supposed that there was not a Northern man on this floor who was not in favor of the *speedy* and unconditional admission of California. Now we have the declaration by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClernand], that he is opposed to her unconditional admission. He, too, wishes to drive bargains in behalf of Slavery. He wishes to make California purchase her way into the Union by large and important concessions to the slave interests. He is in favor of clogging her with measures for the Government of the Territories—for the settlement of the Texas boundary—for the catching of runaway slaves—in short, with anything and everything which the advocates of Slavery may demand. He would make California a pack-horse, to be loaded down with whatever burden his allies may choose to place upon her back. He would make her pay dearly for having incorporated into her Constitution that thing so hateful to him, the Proviso of Freedom. He (Mr. W.) was for California, separate from all other questions. He believed it due to that State, due to ourselves, and, above all, required by the voice of a vast majority of the freemen for whom we profess to speak and act.

What, Mr. Chairman, is the spectacle presented here? After having acquired all the slave territory upon the continent—after having annexed Texas in hot haste, and at the hazard of the war which followed that act—now, sir, the free State of California, with a voting population larger than that of one half of the slave States—larger than Florida, larger than Arkansas, larger than Texas, larger, in my judgment, than either Missisippi or Louisiana—this free State is denied admission into the Union, only because she is *free*. Yes, sir, her only offence is, that she has prohibited Slavery within her borders. Those who now ask that action shall be had upon this subject are denounced as men who desire to keep up a "miserable excitement" in the public mind. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClernand] may, in his conception of things, regard it as a miserable vocation for men to contend earnestly, seriously, manfully, for the advance of Freedom, for the triumph of truth. The gentleman may regard those efforts only as noble and praiseworthy which are put forth in the cause of Slavery propagandism, and which are rewarded with the smiles of slaveholders and the prospect of office. A "miserable agitation" indeed! to stand up here and battle against the selfishness of the day, to utter unwelcome truths in the ears of lordly masters, to expose the schemes of unchastened ambition, to labor earnestly to bring back this Government to the policy of its founders, to insist that the policy of Jefferson, and the fathers of the Republic, should be applied to the Territories of this Union.

He (Mr. W.) could tell the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClernand] how this agitation, which he so much deprecates, might have been avoided. Had Representatives faithfully carried out the will of their constituents, the question of Slavery in our Territories would have been settled three years ago, by the extension to them of that provision of the Ordinance of 1787, which prohibits Slavery except for crime. Of this there can be no doubt.

He (Mr. W.) has said before, and he repeated now, that when the Proviso was first introduced, there were but two Northern votes against it in this House. One was that of the gentleman from Illinois, and the other that of his then colleague, now a member of the Senate [Mr. Douglass]. That provision, which the gentlemen has learned from his Southern allies to denounce as most infamous, not only received the approval of the Representatives from the free States, but the unanimous and spontaneous approval of the people throughout every free State in this Union. The people by every form of expression endorsed it. Legislatures, by unanimous resolutions, endorsed it. Had the public voice then been faithfully obeyed in this and the other wing of the Capitol, all that excitement and agitation about which the gentleman declaims with such genuine Southern feeling, would have been avoided. The question would have been settled without agitation, without excitement; and, in my judgment, without leaving behind any very serious heart-burnings upon the feelings of our Southern friends. True, sir, they might have been ignorant of the merits of their distinguished champion, the gentleman from Illinois. The country might have never known that it held within its bosom one of such broad, such comprehensive, such exalted patriotism. This, he (Mr. W.) confessed, would have been a serious loss to the country, and a great personal sacrifice to the gentleman from Illinois; but one which, he trusted, would have been cheerfully made, to avoid that agitation which so alarms and disturbs the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, it has become quite common for certain gentlemen, distinguished alike for their patriotism and modesty, to claim for themselves that they stand upon a broad and national platform; and to denounce all who do not take position with them, as narrow-minded, sectional, and fanatical. Is Slavery national, and freedom sectional? He (Mr. W.) had been taught by the fathers of the republican school that freedom was broad and national, and Slavery local and sectional. For this great doctrine he had strugged here, and for this he should continue to struggle, with all the feeble powers God had given him. This great doctrine of the universality of freedom, as one of the inalienable rights of man, and of the local character of Slavery, as a State and sectional institution, constituted, in the early days of the Republic, an established article in the republican creed. Hence, the efforts of Jefferson to circumscribe the limits of Slavery—efforts gloriously successful in the establishment of the Ordinance of 1787—by which freedom was secured to the State which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClernand] in part represents. But for this Ordinance, which the gentleman now denounces as infamous, the curse of Slavery would have rested like an incubus upon his own State. It would have gone there in defiance of the Ordinance, had Illinois, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, been blessed, or cursed (her people will judge which), with a superabundance of that broad and comprehensive patriotism of which the gentleman boasts. Instead of that free labor, which is fast giving to Illinois prosperity and greatness, the negro slave would have loitered in idleness upon her fertile fields, or been driven by the lash to his thriftless and unwilling toil.

He (Mr. W.) had followed in the footsteps of Jefferson; he had travelled in the beaten tracks of the fathers of the republican party. His efforts had been to circumscribe Slavery within State limits—not to interfere with it there, but to resist its spread over the free Territrries of the nation—to relieve the General Government from all responsibility for its existence or support, leaving it to rest, where alone it should rest, upon State sovereignty and State laws.

This question of Slavery extension is a great pecuniary question—a question of capital—of money. The immense capital invested in slaves, as effectually controls this Government as does the capital invested in the funded debt of Great Britain control that. The old proverb, that "money rules the world," is as true in political as in social affairs. The money invested in slaves wields the destines of this boasted free Republic. It shapes its policy to its own ends, it elects its Presidents, and dispenses its vast patronage; it proscribes its enemies, and exalts its friends. So far as legislation and all the machinery of Government is concerned, it in truth and fact constitutes the Republic itself. Well-informed Southern men in this and in the other branch of Congress have estimated the amount of money invested in slaves at *sixteen hundred millions* of dollars. He thought the estimate a large one, but that the sum is large almost beyond computation, is certain. This vast money power, extending over half of the Confederacy, and binding together in the bonds of a common pecuniary interest half the States, dictates law to this Republic, and rules with a despotism unrelenting as death. As a Democrat, he had ever been opposed to great moneyed interests. The instincts of money are the same the world over—the same here as in the most grinding despotism of Europe. Money is cold, selfish, heartless. It has no pulse of humanity, no feelings of pity or of love. Interest, gain, accumulation, are the sole instincts of its nature; and it is the same, whether invested in manufacturing stock, bank stock, or the black stock of the South. Intent on its own interest, it is utterly regardless of the rights of humanity. It would coin dividends out of the destruction of souls. Here, then, sir, we have *sixteen hundred millions of capital*—heartless, unfeeling capital, intent on its own pecuniary advancement. It is here, sir, in these halls, in desperate conflict with the rights of humanity and of free labor. It is struggling to clutch in its iron grasp the soil of the country—that soil which is man's inheritance, and which of right should belong to him who labors upon it. *Sixteen hundred millions of dollars* demands the soil of our territories in perpetuity, for its human chattels—to drive back the free laborer from his rightful field of enterprise—from his lawful and God-given inheritance. Slavery must have a wider field, or the money value of flesh and blood will deteriorate. Additional security and strength must be given to the holders of human stock. What though humanity shrould shriek and wail? Money is insatiate—capital is deaf to the voice of its pleadings. To oppose the extension of Slavery—to resist in the councils of the nation the demands of this huge money power—to advocate the rights of humanity and of free labor, is, in the estimation of the gentleman from Illinois, to be sectional and fanatical. To bow down to this money power—to do its bidding—to be its instrument and its tool—is doubtless, in the esteem of the gentleman, to stand upon a "broad and national platform." Freedom and humanity, truth and justice, is a platform too narrow for his enlarged and comprehensive mind—the universality of Slavery can alone fill its capacious powers. Slavery is Democratic—freedom fanatical! Sir, the gentleman no doubt sees fanaticism in a bold and fearless advocacy of the right. With some minds, nothing is rational and practical, except that which pays well. That Slavery has heretofore paid well to those who labored in its service, he (Mr. W.) was prepared to believe. The history of this Government proves this. Its bills, however, have been at a discount since the Presidential election of '48. Its last draft for the Presidency was dishonored. Its credit is shaken as a prompt paymaster; and the gentleman from Illinois may yet find himself in a fanatical position, expending his great powers, without adequate reward.

He (Mr. W.) was educated in the republican school. All his opinions upon political questions were strongly tinctured with the doctrines of that school. Nowhere in the teachings of the "fathers" had he found it laid down, that Democracy consisted in wearing the collar of Slavery about his neck—in bowing down to a heartless money aristocracy—in supporting the extension of Slavery over the Continent. Such may be the doctrines of the gentleman from Illinois. He may best subserve his political ends, by standing shoulder to shoulder with the advocates of Slavery-Extension. He may esteem that man a demagogue who boldly stands up in the face of power, in defiance of all opposition, the advocate of truth, the inflexible supporter of principle. There are demagogues, however, who succumb to power; who flatter the strong and deride the weak; who are always found in support of that policy best calculated to advance their interests: who are ready to change opinions with a change of dynasty; and who ever lean for support upon some strong, and, as they believe, controlling interest. The Slave Power has so long held ascendency in this Government, that certain gentlemen seem to think that their political fortunes are secure, only when they stand in close alliance with Slavery. They lean upon it for support; they look to it for promotion; they tremble and turn pale at its frowns. Many fear to stand on the rock of Truth, unsupported save by a consciousness of rectitude and duty, who, sensible of their weakness, lean with their whole weight upon the strong arm of some great interest for support.

Mr. Chairman, (he continued,) I am charged by the gentleman from Illinois with practicing the arts of the demagogue—with keeping alive a "miserable excitement," to secure by own elevation to office. When have I been found at the footstool of power? When have I addressed myself to propitiate its smiles or its favor? When have I abandoned principle, and taken refuge in the arms of any great moneyed interest for succor and protection? When have I proved false to my professions, or my pledges? Who is my accuser? No, sir, no; I have kept the faith; I have redeemed the solemn pledges given to a generous constituency—a constituency, sir, that have stood around me, and sustained me, with a devotion and constancy of which any man, the greatest in this nation, might well be proud; and sir, I would sooner stand against the assaults of a thousand such as the gentleman from Illinois, than disappoint the just expectations of the humblest man who gave me his confidence and support.—Does the gentleman from Illinois know anything about the district from which I come? Has he ever informed himself as to the character and political principles of those I represent? For his information I will tell him, that it is one of the strongest Democratic districts in the State of Pennsyl

them then, I am with them now. It is a part of their faith, and a part which will not be compromised or surrendered, that Slavery ought not to be extended over the free soil of this continent. They embrace this great principle as a part of their creed and they will stand by it to the last, against all temptation, and in the face of all opposition. They will adhere to their principles; they will make them the guide of their action, the rule of their conduct. They will follow no organization that has for its object the prostration of their principles. The gentleman from Illinois would read them out of the party. When they are excluded from the Democratic party, it will be past hope in Pennsylvania. That State will then have taken its position permanently in the ranks of the opposition. But I do not believe that they will allow the gentleman from Illinois to excommunicate them from the Democratic party; nor will the denunciations of the entire South move them one jot or title from their principles.

I have said, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment this whole controversy would have been settled without agitation, and without this protracted struggle which some gentlemen profess to think endangers the stability of the Union, had the Representatives from the North faithfully carried out the will of their constituents. I do not intend this remark as a reflection upon the gentleman from Illinois. His district, for aught I know, may be as pro-slavery as himself. It is not my purpose, Mr. Chairman, to reflect upon the motives or conduct of any gentleman in this House. It would be out of order for me to do so; yet I cannot but feel that the true way to settle existing controversies is not by patched-up compromises, which ought to have, and can have, no force, if made against the public sentiment of the country. The principles upon which this controversy should be settled are the same as those upon which all great political questions should be settled in a Government like our own—by an honest and faithful representation on this floor, and in the other branch of Congress of the voice of our respective constituencies. Let every man vote as his constituents desire him to vote—as it was understood he would vote when a candidate for an election to a seat in this Hall—then, sir, you would have expressed the voice of the country. A settlement upon such a basis would stand—would command respect. It would be in harmony with the spirit and genius of our institutions. Upon this basis alone ought all great questions to be settled; and had it been faithfully acted upon, the present controversy would never have had an existence. The question of Slavery in our Territories would have been long since settled, and settled on the side of Freedom. But it would seem that a different atmosphere prevails here from that which gentlemen breath at home. We have here political combinations looking to the Presidency, and to the patronage dispensed from that high office. Men become the mere partizans of Presidential aspirants, instead of the faithful representatives of the People. Party interests and party success exert a controlling influence over the deliberations of Congress. It is but a short time since, when the Representatives from the North, who occupy seats on the other side of this House, were, to a man, the advocates of a positive legislative prohibition against the extension of Slavery. Ay! sir, it was an "old principle of the Whig party! A devoutly cherished doctrine! They had always opposed the controlling influence of Slavery in the Government! The Democracy had always courted and succumbed to the Slave Power." Such, but a short time ago, was the universal language of Northern Whigs, in and out of this House. I well remember with what alacrity and zeal they walked up to the vote—always ready, always anxious. It was not then premature—there was no dodging in those days. Who so blind as not to see that a great change has come over the leaders of that party, and the representatives of that party on this floor? After having obtained power by professions of signal and lasting devotion to Freedom, they now seek to retain it by compromises with Slavery. They are now willing to abandon the old policy of enforcing the Ordinance of 1787. Indeed, they have abandoned it for the "non-action" policy of the late Executive. The new dynasty, it is said, favors a different policy; it is disposed, so says rumor, to take passage in the Omnibus, which has been lumbering its way for months through the Senate. If this be so, we shall soon see a corresponding change in the position of party leaders. Leaders can change to order—the People are not so facile. The masses expect nothing, ask for nothing, from Government, except just and wholesome laws. They love principle, and follow it with earnest and honest purpose, unless misled by ambitious and selfish men. They want the old policy restored, they want securities and guarantees for Freedom—they want the Jeffersonian Ordinance reënacted. If, by the force of circumstances, our Territories should be preserved from the threatened encroachments of Slavery, and finally be admitted as free States, (a result which non-action leaves to the hazard of chance,) still Slavery will have triumphed, if we fail to assert the rights of freedom. The policy of this Government should be settled now and forever, against the further extension of Slavery. This is rendered necessary by, the startling demands of Slavery, and of its right to extend wherever the flag of the Union floats.

But, as I was saying, our friends on the other side have undergone a change; and I fear that another and more sudden change awaits them. General Taylor is dead. The brave and honest old chief reposes in the grave. He has no more favors to bestow; the mantle of his power has fallen upon another. A late Senator, he who "*treads no step backward*," is elevated to the premiership. Henceforth his word is to have a magical influence and power. As Senator, and Taylor living, it had lost its charm; as premier, it is to be potential. I shall expect to see his discoveries in "physical geography" adopted by the faithful. We shall see, sir, what we shall see. Whatever course gentlemen may adopt, one thing is certain, that a large majority took their seats in the present Congress, pledged to the support of the Proviso. This fact is known to those who hear me, and to the whole country. It will stand in history, and the shameful record will also be written, that some were faithless to those pledges—that they sacrificed principle and honor, to propitiate power. There are not three men from the free States, on the opposite side of the House, who, when elected, were not understood by their constituents to be in favor of legislative action against the extension of Slavery. The same is true of a large majority of the Democrats. I know of some who gave their solemn pledges in writing, to stand by the principle to the last, and against all compromises who have publicly declared their purpose to abandon it. This, sir, is shameful; yet it is by such treachery as this, that Slavery is to gain a triumph. If the Ordinance of freedom is to be thus defeated it is not by the voice of the people; it is defeated by the betrayal of their representatives. And is such a betrayal of high trusts to be dignified with the name of "compromise?" Do gentlemen expect such a settlement to stand? Is this the way in which peace is to be restored to the country? Are the people to be cheated, and then called upon to thank as public benefactors those who defrauded them? A distinguished Senator—he again who "treads no step backward"—in a recent speech, labored earnestly to prove that it was the duty of a representative to violate his instructions, to disregard the wishes of his constituents whenever, in his opinion, the public weal would be promoted thereby. He contended that the faithful representative—he who religiously observed his pledges, who faithfully and honestly, by his speech and votes, carried out in these Halls the views of his constituents—was a slave himself, and that a proviso was needed to free such a one from bondage. Sir, neither great talents, nor exalted position, can sanctify such doctrines. They strike at the foundations of our system of Government. They are anti-republican, anti-American. The Senator himself gave us a shameful example of their mischievous influence, when he turned his back upon the unanimous instructions of his own State. I subscribe to no such sentiments. I tolerate no such doctrines, in politics or in morals. I can respect, nay more, I can applaud the man who votes for Slavery, when I believe he is fairly reflecting the principles and feelings of those he represents; but I have only loathing and contempt for him who, by false professions, obtains a high place, and then betrays the confidence reposed in him.

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire agitation; but I cannot consent to avoid it, by a tame and silent submission to wrong. I will not see, without a struggle to avert it, this Government, established by the price of blood, upon the great foundations of Freedom, subverted to the accursed purpose of the extension of Slavery. Its power shall never be wielded to such ends, if by any humble efforts of mine I can prevent it. So long as there can be found such men in the north, as the gentleman from Illinois, to stand here and do the work of Slavery, so long there will be agitation—an agitation that, by-and-by, will reach the constituents of the gentleman, and light up the fires of Truth and Freedom in his district. When that day comes, as it surely will come, we shall hear no more of the gentleman from Illinois, and the like of him.

A great truth cannot be trampled in the dust—a great principle of right cannot be broken down. Freedom will live—truth and justice will live—live in the hearts of men—live in the attributes of God—live forever.

This Government is not a government of Slavery, but of freedom. We hold that Slavery is not a national institution—that it should be kept within the limits of the States where it is tolerated; and these are doctrines which no pretended compromise can crush—no political combinations put down.

In the last Presidential contest, the South brought to bear the influence of this sixteen hundred millions of slave property. She declared that no man should receive her support for the Presidency who did not bow down in abject and slavish submission to this mighty power of the South. Northern aspirants for that high office humbled themselves in the dust, but they failed of the reward. The price of shame and of humiliation was not paid, and I trust in God that it never will be paid. The ambitious and inspiring must learn that they cannot reach the Presidency by a base bowing down to the power of Slavery. This lesson it is the duty of the people to teach them. This is the only remedy for doughfaceism—it is a sure and certain cure; if is a constitutional, a peaceful remedy—the remedy of the ballot-box. I shall not fear to resort to it, whenever occasion requires its application.

Mr. COBB, of Alabama, (Mr. Wilmot yielding the floor.) I wish to ask the gentleman if he would vote for any man for the office of President who was the owner of slaves.

Mr. WILMOT. Certainly sir—most cheerfully, if he agreed with me in principle. I make principle the guide of my political action. Principle, and principle alone, controls my votes; not the location of candidates, or the nature of the property they may hold.

Mr. COBB. Would the gentleman own a slave himself?

Mr. WILMOT. I have no wish to be the owner of one. God forbid that I should ever be placed in circumstances where my interests or convenience should tempt me to become the owner of one. Upon this subject I confess that my moral sensibilities are not as keenly alive to the wrongs of Slavery as they ought to be. I am not so good a man as I wish I was. I wish that I could feel for the wrongs of others as keenly as I feel a wrong when inflicted upon myself. I make no pretension to any such exalted virtue. Gentlemen who have done me the honor to listen to my speeches upon this subject, will remember that I have never discussed this question in its moral aspects. That task I have left to others, better able to do it justice. I have examined it as a political question—as a question affecting the rights of the people, and the policy and character of the Government. Apart from all moral considerations, I am opposed to the further extension of Slavery, as a political evil of the first magnitude. Slavery is anti-republican—it is aristocratic in all its tendencies and results—it is subversive of those great principles which lay at the foundation of all free Governments. It is a great moneyed interest—a vast pecuniary capital, with the heartless instincts of capital, and I am deadly hostile to the control of capital in this Government. It is in theory, and should be in practice, a Government of the people. It belongs to the free masses of the country. It is theirs to enjoy, to defend. They have a right to mould it to their pleasure, to determine its policy, to direct it to the advancement of their happiness and prosperity. Slavery seeks to wield it to its own selfish ends—to the support and perpetuation of its vast capital in human flesh and blood. I oppose the extension of Slavery, because it is an element of weakness in States. I speak with no feelings of unkindness towards the South, but I utter my earnest convictions when I say, that the South is weak—weak in all the elements of strength and greatness—weak to resist a foreign foe, and only weak because of the institution of Slavery. It is the men who perform the labor of a country that must defend it in the hour of danger. The men who perform the labor of the South are slaves. You dare not place the means of defence in their hands. You dare not give them arms, and teach them their use, lest they turn them against yourselves. If your young and able-bodied men go to the field in large numbers, you leave your families, your women and children, exposed to a terrible enemy at home. It is an element of weakness in States, and for this reason I am opposed to its extension.

Another reason: notwithstanding the vast increase of Slavery in the last sixty years, I entertain the hope so ardently cherished by our fathers, of its ultimate extinction. I look forward to some day—remote it may be—when the South, in its own way, and by its own voluntary action, will set about the great work of emancipation, and the separation of the two races; in which work, I trust the North will cooperate to the full extent of its resources and power. The day must come, or there will be a night of terror and of blood. Slavery cannot be eternal. I cannot contemplate the prospect of perpetual Slavery, without seeing the future of my country shrouded in darkness and in gloom. The extension of Slavery will postpone the day of deliverance—magnify its difficulties, if, indeed it does not make them insurmountable. Slavery I have before stated to be a pecuniary question—a question of capital, of dollars and cents. This is the light in which it is viewed by the master; to the slave it is a question of liberty, and of all a man holds dear and sacred. It will continue so long as it is valuable—so long will those who have property in it hold on to Slavery with a grasp that cannot be broken. Every one acknowledges that Slavery would become valueless much sooner, if confined to its present limits, than if extended over a wider space. This, Southern gentlemen tell us, is the reason why they are determined to extend it; and they charge upon us, who are opposed to its extension a, desire to bring about abolition, by hemming them in, and thereby making their property worthless. We do no wrong to our Southern friends in opposing the extension of Slavery, although the policy of non-extension will hasten the day when slaves shall be without value, and Slavery shall cease to exist. God has established certain great laws, by the silent and sure operation of which, Slavery must ultimately be extinguished. It cannot long stand against the law of population, without constant expansion. If the laws of nature and of population necessarily tend to diminish the value of slave property, why should we be called upon to retard their operation—to save the institution of Slavery from their influence by an extension of its area? Gentlemen of the South see that the field of labor is fast filling up; that the laborers are increasing, and that, unless the field is enlarged, labor will cheapen, and the laborer himself become worthless as an element of property. They see clearly that at no distant day they will be compelled, by the force of natural laws, to commence the work of emancipation, unless that day is put off by the opening of new fields for slave labor. Sir, I would not obstruct the operation of God's laws. I certainly would not interfere to save Slavery from their influence. Looking, as I do, to the day of our ultimate redemption from this curse, I wish it to come before the evil shall have grown to such giant proportions as to defy our efforts for a peaceful deliverance. I do not wish the evil to grow beyond our control. We might, by a mighty effort, solve peacefully, and without blood, the problem of Slavery, with ten millions of blacks. No human power can solve it with fifty or a hundred millions. It would break in fragments the strongest Government on earth; it would produce scenes of commotion, strife, and blood, such as the world never saw. Why will gentlemen bring certain and wide-spread ruin upon the country? It is the spirit of selfishness that invokes this destruction upon our land—the selfishness of great interests, the selfishness of capital, blind to everything but its immediate and proximate interest. For resistance to this spirit of selfishness, for seeking to avert from my country this terrible doom, I am assailed by the gentleman from Illinois, in borrowed wit, and studied denunciation.

Mr. Chairman, talk as gentlemen may, there is a settled and fixed determination on the part of the people in the free States to resist, by every lawful and constitutional means, the extension of Slavery. They may be betrayed by their representatives—I fear they will be; they may, for a time, be misled by those in whom they have placed confidence—party leaders may lick the dust at the bidding of Slavery, may kiss its bloody hands—party organization may be used to crush the advocates of liberty—yet, sir, the great heart of the people beats for freedom. Gentlemen will learn that a cheat is no settlement—that a betrayal of trust is no adjustment of difficulties—that the arrangements of Presidential aspirants is no compromise. Agitation is not to be quieted by the perpetration of wrong. The friends of freedom will counsel no resistance to established law; but they will not cease to appeal to the judgments and the hearts of men, in behalf of righteousness and truth. Gentlemen want peace, quiet. Cease to urge a wrong, and you will have a peace. What is the quiet they want? Freedom from agitation on the subject of Slavery. I will tell gentlemen how they can have quiet on this subject: Separate the General Government from all responsibility for the existence or support of Slavery. Keep your institutions within your States, and you will have no agitation. Cease to exert the tyranny of Slavery in this Government—immolate no more Northern men. You provoke agitation by the injustice of your demands. You declare your purpose to extend Slavery into free territory, and when we offer resistance, when we demand for freedom the protection and security of law, you cry out against agitation. You ask us to reverse the policy of the Government in behalf of Slavery and its interests, and because we refuse, you complain of injustice and wrong. We are struggling to maintain, against your encroachments, the early and settled policy of the Government. I stand upon this question of Slavery extension, where Jefferson, and Madison, and Henry, stood sixty years ago. Were they now living, they would advocate the policy I have advocated. They did so, in their day and generation. They would do so now.

It is the vast increase of this slave capital which has taken place in the last half century, that creates all our present difficulties. From two hundred millions of dollars it has grown to sixteen hundred millions. This immense capital is struggling for perpetuity and power. It wishes to make Slavery eternal. This is your fanaticism, gentlemen of the South—the fanaticism of Slavery—of sixteen hundred millions of dollars! It is a cold, calculating fanaticism. It feeds on the souls and blood of men. Talk to me about fanaticism! May God preserve me from the fanaticism of Slavery—from that fanaticism which forgets humanity and its rights, in the pursuit of an all-absorbing selfishness.

Mr. Chairman, I have been led almost unconsciously into these protracted remarks. I contemplated but a few words when I arose. My object more particularly was to address myself to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClernand], and to repel the charge brought by him against the friends of freedom, of a desire to defeat the appropriation bills. They have never entertained such a thought. They are loyal to the Constitution and to the Government of their country—loyal, sir, and true. They desire action on California—that great question which, more than any other engrosses the mind of the nation. It is a shame—a personal dishonor to Northern men—that California is not yet admitted into the Union. Why this protracted delay? Why this continual postponement of a measure which they all profess to favor? Are gentlemen afraid to act? Are we cowards, that we dare not perform our constitutional duty? Do we fear to take hold of the work which we came here to do? Sir, let us have done with this timid, this cowardly policy. Let us act. There is honor and safety in action—dishonor and danger in further delay. The gentleman from Illinois is waiting the action of the Senate on the "Omnibus bill." After eight months of the session is exhausted, he is for giving time for Slavery to mature its plans. When Slavery is in danger, the gentleman is ever ready and prompt in action. No measure of Slavery was ever delayed an hour for want of the gentleman's aid. Freedom must stand back, and only enter these Halls in the manner and at the hour Slavery shall dictate.

I wish that the vote of to-day should arrest the attention of the country. Let it be known throughout the length and breadth of the land, that the consideration of California was postponed, to make way for an appropriation bill for the support of the Military Academy at West Point—a bill which there was no occasion for pressing upon our attention, and which could have been acted upon a fortnight or a month hence, without any detrjment to the public service. This was done by the votes of the South, united with the great body of Northern Whigs, and a few Northern Democrats. California postponed, after eight months' delay, by the strong vote of *ninety-three to sixty!* Yet, in the face of this vote, men will go home and try to make their constituents believe that they were friendly to the early and unconditional admission of California.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment.... Without Compromise.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1850.

THE SETTLEMENT.

We refer to the Congressional Report for the details of the proceedings at Washington during the past week, whereby a settlement, after a manner, of the great questions which have agitated the country for the past year has been made. It is a compromise eminently pleasing to the South and her friends, as by it she gets all she reasonably could expect to get for Slavery, while the compensation promised to the North in return, miserable as it is, as a promise, is still more contemptible now because yet unfulfilled. But the beatitude offered to those who expect nothing will soften any disappointment which the friends of Freedom might feel at such a result.

That the whole matter may be made clearer than it may seem at once by a perusal of the Congressional report, we subjoin a brief synopsis of all the bills passed, made by The *Tribune*.

1. That the NORTHERN BOUNDARY OF TEXAS shall be the parallel of 36 deg. 30 min. North latitude for three degrees of longitude westward from the old line between the U. States and Mexico, or to the 103d meridian of longitude due west from Greenwich; thence follow that meridian down to the 32d parallel of latitude; thence due west to the Rio Grande, which is made the westerly limit of Texas thence to its mouth. As a compensation for surrendering her claims to territory North of this line, Texas is to receive Ten Millions of Dollars in five per cent bonds of the United States, whereof Five Millions are made specifically applicable to the payment of the Public Debt of Texas.

2. NEW MEXICO, including all the Territory acquired from Mexico North and West of the above line East of the Rio Grande, and all of said Territory West of said River, is organized into a regular Territory, for which Officers are to be appointed and Courts organized as for other Territories of the United States.

3. All the Territory acquired by the United States from Mexico lying Westward of New Mexico as aforesaid and East of California is organized into another Territory under the appellation of UTAH. (This Territory includes the Salt Lake region, or Great Central Basin of our Continent, in which the Mormons have set up their Ebenezer.)

4. CALIFORNIA is admitted into the Union as a STATE, with her chosen Boundaries and her Free Constitution; so that her two Senators and two Members already chosen may take their seats forthwith.

5. The Territories of New Mexico and Utah as aforesaid are to be admitted into the Union as States, with or without Slavery, as their People shall decide.

It is well, also, to put on record the vote by which the boundary of New Mexico is thus fixed, and the ten millions paid to Texas. The *Post* makes it out as follows:

YEAS.

NORTHERN VOTE—*Whigs*—Andrews, N Y; Bokee, N Y; Briggs, N Y; Brooks, N. Y; Butler, Penn, Casey, Penn; Chandler, Penn; Duer, N. Y, Duncan, Mass; Elliot, Mass; Grinnell, Mass; Kerr, R I; Levin, Penn; McKissick, N Y; Nelson, N Y; Phœnix, N Y; Pitman, Penn; Rose, N Y; Schem-rhorn N Y; Taylor, Ohio; Thurman, N Y; Underhill, N Y; Walden, N Y; White, N Y, Wilson N H.—25 *Democrats*—Albertson, Ind; Brown, Ind; Buel, Mich; Dimmick, Penn; Disney, Ohio; Durham, Ind; Fuller, Maine; Gilmore, Penn; Gorman, Ind; Hibbard, N H; Hoagland, Ohio; Leffler, Iowa; Littlefield, Me; Mann, Penn; McClernand, Ill; McDonald, Ind; McLanahan, Penn; Peaslee, N H; Potter, N H; Richardson, Ill; Robbins, Pa; Robinson, Ind; Ross, Penn; Strong, Penn; Thompson, Penn, Whittlesey Ohio; Wildrick, N J; Young, Ill—29.

SOUTHERN VOTE.—*Whigs*—Alston, Ala; Anderson, Tenn; Bowie, Md; Breck, Ky; Cabell, Fla; Caldwell, Ky; Caldwell, N C; Deberry, N C; Gentry, Tenn; Haymond, Va; Hilliard, Ala; Houston, Del; Kerr, Md; Marshall, Ky; McLean, Ky; Morehead, Ky; Morton, Va; Outlaw, N C; Owen, Ga; Shepherd, N C; Stanly, N C; Thompson, Ky; Toombs, Ga; Williams, Tenn—24 *Democrats*—Bay, Missouri; Bayly, Va; Beale, Va; Boyd, Ky. Bowlin, Mo; Cobb, Ala; Edmonson, Va; Ewing, Tenn; Green, Mo; Hall, Mo; Hammond, Md; Harris, Tenn; Howard, Texas; Johnson, Tenn; Jones, Tenn; Kaufman, Texas; Mason, Ky; McDowell, Va; McLane, Md; McMullen, Va; Parker, Va; Savage, Tenn; Stanton, Tenn; Stanton, Ky; Thomas, Tenn; Watkins, Tenn; Wellborn, Ga—27

NAYS.

NORTHERN VOTE—*Whigs*—Alexander, N Y; Baker, Ill; Bennett, N Y; Burrows, N Y; Butler, Conn, Calvin, Penn; Clark, N Y; Cole, Wis; Conger, N Y; Corwin, Ohio; Dickey, Penn; Dixon, R I; Evans, Ohio; Fowler, Mass; Gott, N Y; Halloway, N Y; Hebard, Vt; Henry, Vt; J. G. King, N J; J. A. King, N Y; H. Mann, Mass; Matteson, N Y; McGaughey, Ind; Meacham, Vt; Moore, Penn; Newell, N J; Ogle, Penn; Olds, Ohio; Otis, Me; Putnam, N Y; Reed, Penn; Reynolds, N Y; Rockwell, Mass; Rumsey, N Y; Sackett, N Y; Schenck, Ohio; Schoolcraft N Y; Silvester, N Y; Stevens, Van Dyke, N J; Vinton, Ohio—40—*Democrats*—Bingham, Mich; Casle, Ohio, Carter, Ohio; Doty, Wis, Harlan, Ind, Morris Ohio, Peck, Vt, Sawtelle, Me, Stetson, Me, Sweetzer, Ohio, Waldo, Ct, Wentworth, Ill. *Free Soil*—Allen, Mass, Campbell, Ohio, Durkee, Wis, Giddings, Ohio, Howe, Penn, Hunter, Ohio, Julian, Ind, P. King N Y, Root, Ohio, Sprague, Mich, Tuck, N H.—12.

SOUTHERN VOTE—*Whigs*—Clingman, N. C—1.—*Democrats*—Ashe, N C, Averett, Va, Bocock, Va, Bowden, Ala, Brown, Miss, Burt, S C, Colcock, S C, Daniel, N C, Featherston, Miss, Haralson, Ga, Harris, Ala, Holladay, Va, Holmes, S C, Hubbard, Ala, Inge, Ala, Jackson, Ga, Johnson, Ark, Lasere, La, McWillie, Miss, Meade, Va, Millson, Va, Morse, La, Orr, S C, Phelps, Mo, Powell, Va, Thompson, Miss, Venable, N C, Wallace, S C, Woodward, S C.—29.

—The amendments to the Bills were acceded to by the Senate on Monday, and each received the signature of President Fillmore on the same day.

CULTIVATION OF COTTON IN JAMAICA.

THE attention of the cotton consumers in England, and of the planters in Jamaica, has been recently turned to the subject of Cotton-growing in that Island, and some experiments, it appears, have already been made to test the possibility of such culture. Should they be successful, the Southern planters will find a formidable rivalship in the West Indies, and an important influence must eventually be exercised upon the trade of this country. It is, however, a work of time and of difficulty to turn the labor of a community into a new channel, and this, even if there is no other obstacle in the way, must render it, for a good while, a doubtful question whether cotton shall become a staple of those Islands. It is, nevertheless, an interesting movement, and especially so to those among us who devote their energies to induce others to confine themselves to the use of Free Labor products. By such persons the following letter to the *Evening Post* will be read with interest:

KINGSTON, Jamaica, August 29, 1850.

"I write chiefly to give you the earliest information about the cotton movement here. We have had an important meeting this week, at which the Chief Justice presided, for the purpose of establishing a small experimental company for the growth of cotton. On the day of this meeting, we had the delight of intelligence from Manchester, in England, that a company had been established there, for the cultivation of cotton in this Island. We are now becoming all much excited, and there can be no doubt that, before six months pass, there will be an exportation to England of some considerable amount. There are several hundreds of acres now in cultivation, and it is extending every day. The specimens already forwarded are highly esteemed. Estates and lands of all kinds fit for cotton have been depressed exceedingly in value, but now they must rise, and he may consider himself a fortunate man who obtains possession of property in here, at the present low prices. What a fine opening this island now presents to men of delicate health in America, who are dependent for comfort and existence in a mild climate, to make it their place of general residence, and there is field for enterprise, and exertion. They could easily do so without involving the abandonment of their country, as the distance is only six days of pleasant steam navigation.

"I pray you to caution those who feel interested about our island, against the fear of not being able to find labor for their enterprises. There is no difficulty in finding labor at twenty-five cents a day. It is not very effective, but then it is not very dear. Were any considerable number of your black and brown population to transport themselves to this place, how warm would be the welcome on every side. We greatly desire them, not so much as laborers, but as settlers. The land is cheap, fruitful, and varied in its productions; and the markets afford highly remunerating prices. Good American pork-breeders, and butchers and curers, could make much money here. Pork sells in our markets at from twelve to eighteen cents per pound. I am hopeful that we may have many visitors this autumn from America and England, in search of health and of a good and pleasant field for agricultural enterprise."

—In connection with the foregoing letter, we (*Post*) publish the following extract from an article in the *Trelawny*, a Jamaica paper of considerable influence:

"A few weeks ago, we rode round a field of some fifty acres of cotton, in company with two other gentlemen of this town, and the gentleman in charge of the plantation stated that the peasantry appeared to like the description of labor required for its cultivation. The plants looked healthy, and it may not prove uninteresting to our readers if we give an account of its preparation and progress. The field was ruinate land, with logwood growing upon it. Eighteen acres were cleaned, digged, and planted in two weeks, which ended on the 19th May last. The plant did not make its appearance above ground until the sixth day after being planted.

"There was no rain until the 26th of May, and the growth of the plant after the first shower was rapid. Almost every seed took, four being planted in each hole. The cotton first blossomed on the 25th June, the plants being about nine inches high; the piece was thinned in the latter end of June. The cotton was planted in rows of six feet apart, and the holes dug twelve inches square, five feet apart from each other. The planting of the remaining twelve acres was finished on the 25th June; these came up three days after being planted, having had the advantage of a good shower immediately after the seed had been put into the earth. The pods of the first plants were formed on the 1st of July, and by the 9th of the same month were as large as eggs. We are informed that the gentleman who has this plantation intends having the cultivation extended to about one hundred acres; and from all the information we have gathered on this important question, we anticipate the happiest results."

SPEECH OF MR. BROOKS.—We copy, on the first page of this week's paper, the Speech of one of the Representatives in Congress from this city, Mr. Brooks, of the *Express*. It is characterised by the *Journal of Commerce* as 'sensible and manly,' and its author commended as the 'first Whig Representative from the North who has fairly taken the bull by the horns'—a panegyrick which, were it deserved by the party, would be a reflection upon the political sagacity of Mr. Brooks. That gentleman, however, though geographically a Representative from the North, is so in no other sense. His interests are identical with the slave-breeders and traders of Virginia, and he, of course, denies the necessity of any limit to the extension of Slavery. The Editor of the *Journal* expresses a fear that some other members from this city may take a different view of the will of their constituents on this subject, and assures them, whether truly or not, evidently with the hope that the prophecy may conduce to its own fulfilment, 'that no more Wilmot Proviso men, known to be such, will ever go to Congress from this city.' The members referred to, however, if they do not agree with Mr. Brooks because they are not slave-breeders in fact, may also disregard the threat of the Editor who is only not a slave-trader because he lacks the opportunity.

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY is to be held on the 15th, 16th and 17th of next month, in the Horticultural Hall, at West Chester, Chester Co., Pa. The *Freeman* bespeaks a large attendance of the Abolitionists of that section of the county, and it will, no doubt, be fully responded to. It adds:

All who mean to attend from this city are requested to leave early notice at the Anti-Slavery Office. Arrangements will be made to secure cheap, and at the same time respectable, board and lodging in West Chester, for all who may attend. A local committee of arrangements, of persons residing in the place, has been designated by the Executive Committee, whose names will be announced so soon as word is received of their acceptance of the appointment.

We copy the notice for the benefit not only of those in Pennsylvania who may not see the *Freeman*, but for those, also, in other States, who may contemplate attending the meeting.

☞ *The Tribune* says that a charge is afloat against Mr. Gorman a member of Congress, and who served in the Mexican War that 'he was engaged in or cognizant of the printing in Spanish during the Mexican War of Mr. Corwins's noble anti-War Speech of 1847 or 8, in order to create the false impression that *the Mexicans* had translated and printed it in order to excite their people to a more determined resistance to our invading army.' 'Will Mr. Gorman,' asks *The Tribune*, 'inform us whether he had or had not a hand in that dirty trick? or if he knows who had?' The honorable member probably will not think it worth his while to answer any such impertinent queries.

APPEAL IN BEHALF OF CHAPLIN.

We have received the following Circular, sent to us, we presume, that it may find a place in the columns of the *Standard*. We commend it to the attention of our readers:

Circular from the Chaplin Fund Committee.

BELIEVERS IN JESUS CHRIST—LOVERS OF IMPARTIAL LIBERTY—HUMANE MEN AND WOMEN—TO YOU WE APPEAL.

CAZENOVIA, Aug. 22, 1850.

WILLIAM L. CHAPLIN, a native of Massachusetts, long a resident of the State of New York—the accomplished gentleman, the ripe scholar, the upright statesman, the whole-souled philanthropist, the sincere, practical christian; WILLIAM L. CHAPLIN is imprisoned at the city of Washington, the Capital of our Republic, charged,

First. With having assisted certain enslaved fellowmen in their attempt to escape from bondage, and

Secondly. With an assault upon those who arrested him, with an intent to kill them.

For these alleged offences, he is now held in "duress vile" by the Police of the District of Columbia, and also under a requisition of the Governor of Maryland.

Now be it known to all men, that he did not commit the second offence named above. At the time of his seizure he had no weapon of violence about his person, nor does he ever wear any; neither did he know that his companions were armed; much less did he counsel them to make resistance. All this we know and do affirm. He was ignorant too of the character of the persons who seized him. No warrant for his arrest was announced. A band of men, like ruffians, in the darkness of night came upon him, on the highway, and the first salutation he received was a savage yell, and a blow that felled him senseless to the earth. When he recovered from the shock, he was in the hands of four stout men, and therefore powerless.

The persons who were with Mr. Chaplin made an effort (unhappily without success) to save themselves from the monsters who would return them into Slavery. But no one, of either party, was seriously injured, unless it were the self-sacrificing Chaplin. He was severely bruised by the ruffians who captured him.

The other charge, *that he helped men in their attempt to escape from Slavery*, if true, should fix upon his good name the stigma of no crime, unless it be a crime to act in obedience to the command of Christ, to *follow the example of the good Samaritan.*

Chaplin has the heart of a man, quickened by the spirit of "the Son of man." He was in that bad region of our country which is infested by the worst of robbers, where men and women are often found stripped, not so much of their raiment, as of all the rights of human beings; wounded, many of them in their persons, but all of them in their feelings, in the tenderest relations of life; and left with not indeed so much as half of what constitutes the true life of men. Surely, if the poor traveller between Jerusalem and Jericho was to be pitied, and his relief attempted, notwithstanding the dangers of the place, much more, every Christian must allow, should we attempt (at any hazards to ourselves) the rescue of a fellow-man, who is subjected to the terrible wrongs of American Slavery.

W. L. Chaplin, if he has done all that the charge alleges, has done no more than the good Samaritan would do; and for this we honor, we love him. To deliver him from confinement, therefore, as soon as possible, that he may renew and redouble his generous exertions in the cause of suffering humanity, we feel ourselves impelled by the highest sense of duty, and the deepest feelings of sympathy with him, and brotherly kindness to all men. We call upon all, who have any love of christian heroism, to help us. The last man who should be kept in confinement, or subjected to any disabilities in our country, or in our world, is the man who is ever ready to spend his time, his strength, his all, to break the yoke of the oppressor, and set the captive free! Such is the man who is imprisoned in the jail of the United States!!

We plead, we insist, we demand, that his prison door be thrown open, not so much for his sake (for we know he counts it joy to suffer in the cause of humanity) as for our own sakes, that we may quicken our own and each other's love of liberty, by doing honor to his exalted spirit of self-sacrificing philanthropy.

We came to this Cazenovia Convention that we might congratulate some of the many in this region who have escaped from a worse than Egyptian bondage, and advise with them and their friends, as to the obligations that rest upon us in regard to the millions of our countrymen, who are longing to be likewise free. There have been with us about fifty fugitives; but the fugitive's bravest friend has not been here; and we have almost forgotten the fifty who are safe, in our concern for the one who is left behind in the clutches of those who have no respect for the rights of colored men, or of the colored men's friends.

The story of Chaplin's capture has been told us by a devoted fellow-laborer; and most of the time of the Convention has been given to the consideration of his case. We were shown that the expenses, already incurred in his behalf, the legal processes to which we may be obliged to resort, and the services of the ablest counsel, will demand of his friends an amount not less than *twenty thousand dollars*. But what is that for us to pay, if those in our country, who profess to love the practical application of the principles of christianity, will give their due proportion? No one would be impoverished; nay, all would be enriched; for whatever is given in such a cause as this, is so invested as to yield an incomparably better interest than any soulless corporations pay. Let, then, the rich men give their hundreds, and the poor widows their mites, that all may share in the joy of Chaplin's deliverance; and that the people of our land and other lands may know that there are many thousands in this Republic who will not bow the knee to Baal, but respect and love the *Liberator*, although he be chained in a dungeon, far more than the *Oppressor* of our fellow-men, though he walk at large in the palace of our nation.

What is to be done for Chaplin, must be done quickly. A generous contribution, and a more generous subscription were made by the members of the Convention just closed. And a large Committee were appointed to hasten with this appeal to all the good and true, and urge you to respond at once to this demand upon your purses. Give freely. Give without delay. Measure your contributions by your abilities, and both the amount and the readiness of your gifts by the Golden Rule—that there may be nothing wanting to show the respect that is due to our brother, and to defend him triumphantly against all legal and illegal tyranny.

The following well known men are the *Chaplin Fund Committee*, by appointment of the Cazenovia Convention:

James C. Jackson, of Scott, Cortland County, N. Y.; *Joseph C. Hathaway*, of Farmington, Ontario County, N. Y.; *Frederick Douglass* and *George W. Clarke*, of Rochester; *Charles A. Wheaton* and *Samuel J. May*, of Syracuse; *George Lawson*, of Oriskany, Oneida County, N Y.; *William R. Smith*, of Macedon, Wayne County; *George W. Jonson*, of Buffalo; *Cyrus P. Grosvenor*, of McGrawville, N. Y.; *William Harned*, 61 John street, New York City; *Joshua R. Giddings*, Ashtabula, Ohio; *S. P. Chase*, of Cincinnatti, Ohio; *George W. Julian*, of Indiana; *Charles Durkee*, Southport, Wisconsin; *James H. Collins*, Chicago, Illinois; *Charles C. Foote*, Commerce, Oakland County, Michigan; *Francis Jackson*, Bostog; *John G. Whittier*, Amesburg, Mass.; *Silas Cornell* and *Thomas Davis*, Providence, R. I.; *Julius F Lemoyne*, of Washiugton, Penn.; *E. M. Davis* and *C. D. Cleaveland*, of Philadelphia; *Samuel Fessenden*, of Portland, Maine; *Rowland T. Robinson*, Ferrisburgh, Vt.; *Ednah D. Thomas*, Aurora, Cayuga County, N Y.; Rev. *John Todd*, D. D., Pittsfield, Mass.

To either of these persons you may commit your donations or subscriptions of money, and they will account for them to the Treasurer of this Fund. Through either of these persons, also, you may transmit directly to our beloved Chaplin, any tokens of your regard.

James C. Jackson is the Chairman of this CHAPLIN FUND COMMITTEE; *Charles A. Wheaton* and *Samuel J. May*, of Syracuse, are the Secretaries; *Gerrit Smith* is the Treasurer; and to them, in connection with their colleagues named above, the Convention have seen fit to entrust the management of the defence of Chaplin, and the expenditure of he funds that shall be committed to them for that purpose, of all which a full report will be given in due season.

JAMES C. JACKSON, Chairman.

CHARLES A. WHEATON, } Secretaries.
SAMUEL J. MAY, }

CONGRESSIONAL.

SLAVE TRADE IN THE DISTRICT—TEXAS BOUNDARY.

SENATE, September 3d.

On motion of Mr. Clay, the Bill to abolish the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia was taken up. Mr Clay briefly explained and advocated the Bill. Its object was to abolish the foreign Slave Trade in the District. The bringing of slaves and placing them in depots, not for the purpose of sale in the District, but for sale and shipment to Southern States. The bill did not propose to interfere in the least degree with the sale of

ever an Appropriation bill was taken up it would be held on to until disposed of finally.

Mr. Foote declared that he would never vote a dollar for the Government until the questions relative to Slavery, now pending, were settled; and unless the existing measures to accomplish that end were passed, he should build another Omnibus and attach it to the appropriations, voting for or against the whole as one measure. So help him Heaven, if every other Senator should prove unfaithful to his duty, he would vote neither appropriation or adjournment until these agitating questions were settled.

The motion to postpone was rejected.

After further debate, in the course of which the general subject of mail steam ships was incidentally discussed, Mr. Yulee's amendment was rejected. The amendments of the Committee were adopted, and the bill ordered to be engrossed.

HOUSE, September 4th.

After the disposal of the business of the morning hour, the House took up the Texas Boundary bill.

The Speaker announced the question pending to be to refer it to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union.

Mr. McLane rose and withdrew the motion for the previous question.

Messrs. Allen, Wentworth and others, immediately endeavored to get the floor, but the gentlemen from Maryland still retained it.

Mr. McLane said that a commitment of the bill would be tantamount to its rejection. His object was to pass the bill in the aspect in which it would be most acceptable to him, and he was understood to say that in its present form it had most strength in both branches of Congress

Mr. Root raised a question of order whether Mr. Mc Lane, having made a speech yesterday, could make one to-day.

The Speaker decided that Mr. McLane was entitled to the floor.

After some time spent on this point,

Mr. Root appealed, and the question being taken, the appeal was laid on the table.

Mr. McLane had no further remarks to make, and renewed the demand for the previous question on committing the bill to the test of the House.

The previous question was seconded; Ayes 99, Nays 90.

Mr. Cable of Ohio moved to lay the bill on the table, and on the question being taken it was decided in the negative.

YEAS—Messrs. Allen, Baker, Bennett, Booth, Bowdon, Burt, Cable, Campbell, Clark, Colcock, Holmes, Howe, Inge, Julian, Preston King, Matteson, McQueen, Olds, Orr, Root, Sackett, Schoolcraft, Thaddeus Stevens, Wallace, Woodward—30.

Nays 169. So the bill was laid on the table.

The question was taken on ordering the main question to be put—Yeas 133, Nays 68—and then, on the motion to commit the bill to the Committee of the Whole. Before the vote was announced several members changed their votes, and the result was announced—Yeas 101, Nays 99. So the bill was committed.

Amid great confusion various questions were asked of and answered by the Chair.

Mr. Walden moved to reconsider the vote just taken.

Mr. Root moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table, and the result was—Yeas 103, Nays 102. The Speaker voted in the negative, making a tie, and thus lost the question.

The question then recurred on the reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was committed to the Committee of the Whole, and it was reconsidered.

After reconsidering the vote by which the bill was committed, the question recurred on committing, and it was decided in the negative—Yeas, 106; Nays, 108.

The bill was now before the House. The vote was first on the amendment of Mr. Clingman to Mr. Boyd's proposing to organize Southern California under the name of Colorado, by the line 36 deg. The amendment was disagreed to—Yeas, 69; Nays, 130.

Mr. Thompson of Miss. understood that there was now only one amendment pending, that of Mr. Boyd, to add the New Mexico Territorial Bill. He moved to lay the bill on the table as a test vote.

Mr. Bayly protested against its being a test vote. Several voices said, "So do I."

Mr. Thompson withdrew his motion, and as he renewed it the question was taken.

The House refused to lay the bill on the table—Yeas 39, Nays 141.

Mr. Boyd's amendment providing a Territorial Government for New Mexico, nearly the same as the Senate's bill, was disagreed to—Yeas 98, Nays 106.

YEAS—Messrs. Albertson, Altsön, Anderson, Ashe, Bay, Bayly, Beale, Bokee, Bowie, Bowlin, Boyd, Breck, Briggs, Brooks, Brown, Buel, Butler, Pa. Cabell, Fa. Caldwell, Ky. Caldwell, N. C. Casey, Clingman, Cobb, Ala. Daniel, Debery, Dimmick, Duer, Dunham, Edmonson, Eliot, Ewing, Fuller, Gentry, Gerry, Gilmore, Gorman, Hall, Hammond, Harralson, Harris, Ill. Harris, Ten. Haymond, Hibbard, Hilliard, Hoagland, Houston, Howard, Jackson, Ga. Johnson, Tenn. Johnson, Ky. Jones, Kaufman, Kerr, La Sere, Leffler, Levin, Littlefield, Mann, Pa. Marshal, Mason, McClernand, McDonald, McDowell, McGaughey, McLane, Md. McLean, Ky. McMullen, McWillie, Moorhead, Morton, Outlaw, Owen, Parker, Phœnix, Pitman, Powell, Richardson, Robbins, Robinson, Rose, Ross, Savage, Shepherd, Stanley, Stanton, Tenn. Stanton, Ky. Strong, Thomas, Thompson, Ky. Toombs, Waldon, Watkins, Welborn, Wildrick, Williams, Wilson, Young.

NAYS—Messrs. Alexander, Allen, Andrews, Averett, Baker, Bennett, Bingham, Booth, Bowdon, Brown, Miss Burrows, Burt, Cable, Calvin, Campbell, Carter, Clark, Colcock, Cole, Conger, Corwin, Crowell, Dickey, Disney, Doty, Duncan, Durkey, Evans, Ohio; Featherston, Fowley, Freedley, Giddings, Gott, Gould, Grinnell, Halloway, Harlan, Harris, Ala. Hebard, Henry, Holladay, Holmes, Howe, Hubbard, Hunter, Inge, Jackson, N. Y.; Johnson, Ark.; Julian, King, R. I.; King, N. J.; John A. King, Preston King, Mann, Mass; Matteson, McKissock, McQueen, Meacham, Meade, Milson, Moore, Morris, Morse, Nelson, Newell, Ogle, Olds, Orr, Otis, Peasley, Peck, Phelps, Putnam, Reed, Reynolds, Rockwell, Root, Rumsey, Sackett, Sawtelle, Schenck, Schemerhorn, Schoolcraft, Seddon, Silvester, Sprague, Stevens, Pa.; Stetson, Sweetzer, Taylor, Thompson, Miss.; Thompson, Pa.; Thurman, Tuck, Underhill, Vandyke, Venable, Vinton, Waldo, Wallis, Wentworth, White, Whittlesey, Woodward.

Further proceedings was had, amid much confusion and several ineffectual motions to adjourn, when the House refused to order the bill to be read a third time—Yeas 80, Nays 120, as follows:

AYES—Messrs. Albertson, Anderson, Andrews, Bayly, Bokee, Bowie, Breck, Briggs, Brooks, Brown, of Miss.; Buel, Butler, of Pa.; Caldwell, of N. C. Casey, Chandler, Cobb, of Ala.; Deberry, Dimmick, Disney, Duer, Dunham, Eliot, Ewing, Fulier, Gentry, Gerry, Gorman, Gould, Grinnell, Hall, Harris, Haymond, Hibbard, of N. H.; Hilliard, Hoagland, Houston, Johnson, of Tenn.; Johnson, of Ky.; Jones, Kauffman, Kerr, King, of N. J.; Leffler, Levin, Littlefield, Mann, of Pa.; McClernand, McDowell, McKissock, McLane, of Md.; McMullen, Moore, Morehead, Morton, Ogle, Outlaw, Parker, Peaslee, Phœnix, Pitman, Robins, Jr. Robinson, Rose, Schenck, Shepherd, Stanley, Strong, Taylor, Thompson, of Pa.; Thompson, of Ky.; Thurman, Underhill, Vandyke, Vinton, Waldon, Watkins, White, Wildrick, Williams, Wilson.

NAYS.—Messrs. Alexander, Allen, Alston, Ashe, Averett, Baker, Bayly, Beale, Bennett, Bingham, Booth, Bowdon, Bowlin, Boyd, Brown, Burrows, Burt, Butler, of Ct.; Cabell, of Fla.; Cable, of Ohio; Caldwell, of Ky.; Calvin, Campbell, Clark, Clingman, Colcock, Cole, Conger, Crowell, Cartter, Dickey, Daniel, Dickson, Doty, Duncan, Durkee, Edmondson, Evans, Featherston, Fitch, Fowler, Freedley, Giddings, Gilmore, Gott, Greene, Halloway, Hammond, Haralson, Harlafd, Harris of Tenn.; Harris of Ala.; Hibbard of Vt.; Hehry, Holiday, Holmes, Howard, Hubbard, Hunter, Inge, Jackson of Ga.; Jackson of New York; Johnson of Ark.; Julian, King of R. I.; King of New York; Preston King, La Sere, Mann of Mass.; Marshall, Mason, Matteson, McDonald, McGaughey, McLean of Ky.; McQueen, McWilde, Meacham Meade, Milson, Morris, Morse, Nelson, Newell, Otis, Olds, Orr, Owen, Peck, Phelps, Potter, Powell, Putnam, Read, Reynolds, Richardson, Rockwell, Root, Ross, Rumsey, Sackett, Savage, Sawtelle, Schemerhorn, Schoolcraft, Seddon, Silvester, Sprague, Stanton of Tenn.; Stanton of Ky.; Stevens of Pa.; Stetson, Sweetser, Thomas, Thompson of Miss.; Toombs, Tuck, Venable, Waldo, Wallis, Wellborn, Wentworth, Whittlesey, Woodward.

Mr. Boyd moved to reconsider the vote, but gave way at 4 o'clock to

Mr. Harris of Tennessee, on whose motion the House adjourned.

SEPTEMBER. 5th.—The buisness of the Senate was unimportant, in the House the SPAKER announced the special order to be the Texas Boundary bill. The question was on the motion of Mr. Boyd to reconsider the vote by which the House refused to order the bill to a third reading.

Mr. Boyd being entitled to the floor said he supposed every gentleman knew his object. It was with a hope that the bill would be finally passed with the amendment he had heretofore offered to provide a Territorial Government for New-Mexico. He had no further remarks to make and moved the previous question.

Mr. Inge moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table. Several questions were asked and the Speaker in reply to one of them said that if the vote be reconsidered the question will recur on ordering the bill to be engrossed for a third reading.

The House refused to lay the motion to reconsider on the table, Yeas 71, Nays 135, and then reconsidered the vote by which the third reading of the bill was refused—Yeas 131, Nays 75.

A dozen gentlemen struggled for the floor, and there was much confusion. It was assigned to.

Mr. Grinnell, who moved to reconsider the vote by which Mr. Boyd's amendment was rejected, and moved the previous question.

Mr. Campbell moved to lay that motion on the table and it was decided in the negative—Yeas 96, Nays 108.

Mr. Van Dyke wished to move that the bill be committed to the Committee of the Whole.

The Speaker decided he could not make the motion, the House having passed from the original bill and were not acting with reference to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the House reconsidered the vote by which Mr. Boyd's amendment was rejected—Yeas 106, Nays 99.

The question recurred on agreeing to Mr. Boyd's amendment and much confusion prevailed. Gentlemen in all directions were jumping to their feet and struggling for the floor, crying "Mr. Speaker." Mr. Boyd was recognized, and after order had been restored

Mr. Meade asked the gentleman to yield him the floor. He wished to offer an amendment which would not interfere with that of the gentleman from Kentucky but which if adopted would give strength to the bill. [Cries of read it for information.]

Mr. Vinton rose to ask a question.

Mr. Burt called him to order, and desired to know whether the gentleman from Kentucky had yielded the floor to him to make the motion or suggestion?

The Speaker said Mr. Boyd could yield only for explanation.

Mr. Boyd was aware of the responsibility which he assumed. He had been asked on each side to yield for amendments, but had refused because he was aware if he should the bill would be destroyed. He had an amendment to the original bill; it was exceedingly simple and he would call the previous question.

Mr. Burt I hope it will be voted down.

Mr. Boyd—I wished to propose an original bill.—Will it be in order to do so?

The Speaker—No amendment can be offered except to that now pending.

Mr. Boyd demanded the Previous Question.

Mr. Kaufman moved an amendment, but the confusion prevented us from hearing what it was.

Mr. Fowler wished to ask a question.

The Speaker said it could be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. Fowler did not obtain it, and he said something which like most of what else was uttered, was absorbed in the general tumult.

The Speaker vigorously applied his hammer, calling gentlemen to order, and those in the aisles to take their seats and saying that it was impossible to transact business unless quiet was restored.

Mr. Meade gave notice that he would offer his amendment. The demand for the Previous Question was negatived, Ayes 88, Nays 98. There was now a volley of voices, like the discharge of musketry, in the endeavor to obtain the floor.

Mr. Toombs was assigned to it, and he proposed an additional section to the amendment of Mr. Boyd, to establish a Territorial Government for New Mexico, by adding that no citizen of the United States shall be deprived of his life, liberty or property, except by the judgment of his peers and the laws of the land, and that the Constitution of the United States and such statutes thereof as may not be locally unapplicable to the common law, as it existed with the British Colonies of America until the Fourth of July, 1799, shall be the exclusive law of said Territory on the subject of African Slavery until altered by the proper authorities."

Mr. Tombs here refrained from debate, as he did not wish to open a protracted debate, and did not desire to move the previous question.

Mr. Wentworth said he was ready to vote on the amendments, and inquired whether it would be in order to propose a substitute for Mr. Tombs's amendment,

The Speaker said an amendment was now pending.

Mr. Wentworth moved to commit the bill to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions so to amend it as to exclude Slavery from all the Territory acquired from Mexico under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo on a line East of California, and for the purpose of accomodating gentlemen, and of getting separate votes on the various subjects. He consented to add a proposition understood as striking from the amendment of Mr. Boyd a portion of the definition of the boundary of New Mexico, and inserting down the main channel of the Rio Grande to a point where it crosses the 102d meridian of longitude, West of Greenwich," and also a proposition to strike out the proviso in the fifth clause of the original bill, that, no more than five millions of said Stock shall be issued until the creditors of the State holding bonds and other certificates of the Stock of Texas, for which duties on imports, specially pledged at the Treasury of the United States, shall execute releases of all claim against the United States for or on account of said bonds or certificates, in such form as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and approved by the President of the United States.

Other proceedings took place.

The Speaker said or was understood to say, that a separate vote could be taken on the several subjects in the instructions.

Mr. Wentworth gave way to Mr. Featherston, who offered a substitute for the bill, namely, that the boundary of the State of Texas, as defined and established by the act of her second Congress, December, 1836, is hereby recognized by the Government of the united States.

After further proceedings, intermingled with confusion, the demand for the Previous Question was seconded and under its operation Mr. Feathertion's subsitute was rejected Yeas 71; Nays 128

A division of the instructions was called for and the Speaker having reviewed his former decision decided that the only vote to be taken was on the motion to commit with instructions and this was indivisible.

Mr. Inge said this was in direct conflict with the previous decision. He had a right to vote on each branch of the instructions, and appealed from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. Wentworth said as some misunderstanding existed he wished to explain.

Mr. Carter appealed to the House to permit him to explain, but objection was made.

Mr. Wentworth wished to withdraw that part of the instructions which he had accepted from other gentlemen, but he was not permitted to do so. The decision of the Chair was sustained—Yeas 101 Nays 86.

Further proceedings were had, when the House refused to commit the bill with the instructions—Yeas 80, Nays 121.

The question now recurred on the amendment of Mr Toombs.

Preston King asked for a division, which was ordered, and the first part of the amendment was agreed to as follows: That no citizen of the United States shall be deprived of liberty or property in said Territory except by the judgment of his peers and the laws of the land. The remaining part of the amendment was rejected—Yeas 64, Nays 131.

Mr. Putnam moved to reconsider the vote on the first clause of the amendment.

Mr. Morse moved an adjournment, which was lost.

Mr. Putnam's motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. Van Dyke moved to adjourn, but the motion did not prevail.

Now the question recurred on agreeing to Mr. Boyd's amendment, very nearly the same as the Senate's New Mexico bill with a few verbal alterations only, and as amended by the first part of Mr. Toombs proposition. There was much anxiety evinced all through the hall, and Mr. Boyd's amendment was agreed to—Yeas 106, Nays 99

Question was now on ordering the Texas Boundary bill, as amended, to a third reading.

Mr. Inge unsuccessfully moved an adjournment.—He then moved to lay the whole subject on the table.—Five or six gentlemen only voted in the affirmative.

During the roll call on ordering the bill to a third reading gentlemen were standing all over the House.—The galleries were crowded and great excitement and anxiety were manifested, as it was thought there would be a tie vote. Before the result was announced votes were changed, and there were cries of 'Report' 'Report the result,' 'Report.' Great confusion prevailed.—Scarcely a seal was occupied.

The Speaker called to order, but it had no effect, and in a loud tone he announced Yeas 99, Nays 107, as follows.

YEAS—Messrs. Alberston, Alston, Anderson, Andrews, Bay, Bayly, Beale, Bokee, Bowie, Bowlin, Boyd, Breck, Briggs, Brooks, Brown, Ia; Buel, Butler, Pa; Cabell, Fa: Caldwell, Ky; Caldwell, N. C; Casey, Chandler, Cobb, Ala: Deberry, Dimmick. Disney, Duer, Duncan, Dunham, Edmundson, Eliot, Ewing, Tenn; Fitch Fuller, Gentry, Gerry, Gilmore, Green, Grinnell, Hall, Hammond, Harris, Tenn. Thomas L. Harris, Haymond Hubbard, Hilliard, Hoagland, Houston, Jackson, Ga; Johnson, Tenn; Johnson, Ky; Jones, Kaufman, Kerr, Leffler, Levin, Littlefield, Man, Pa; Marshall, McClernand, McDonald, McDowell, McKissock, McLanahan, McLane, Md; McLean, Ky; Morehead, Morton, Nelson, Outlaw, Owen, Parser, Peaslie, Phœnix, Pitman, Potter, Richardson, Robbins, Robinson, Rose, Ross, Savage, Shepperd, Stanley, Strong, Taylor Thompson, Pa; Thompson, Ky; Thurman, Toombs, Walden, Watkins, Wellborn, White, Wildrick, Williams Wilson, Young.

NAYS—Messrs. Alexander, Allen, Ashe, Baker, Bennett, Bingham, Booth, Brown, Miss; Burrows, Burt, Butler, Conn! Cable, Ohio; Calvin, Campbell, Cartter, Clark, Clingman, Colcock, Cole, Conger, Corwin, Crowell, Daniel, Dickey, Dixon, Doty, Durkee, Evans, Ohio; Featherston, Fowler, Freedley, Giddings, Gott, Gould, Halloway, Haralson, Harlan, Harris, Ala; Hebard, Holladay, Holmes, Howe, Hubbard, Hunter, Inge, Jackson, Ga; Jackson N. Y.; Johnson, Ark.; Julian, King. R. I; King, N Y.; John A. King, Preston King, La Sere, Mann, Mass; Mason, Matteson, McGaughey, McQueen, McWillie, Meachem, Mattson, Moore, Morris, Morse, Newell, Ogle, Olds, Orr, Otis, Peck, Phelps, Powell, Putnam Reed, Reynolds, Rockwell, Mass.; Root, Rumsey, Sackett, Sawtelle, Schenck, Schemerhorn, Schoolcraft, Seddon, Silvester, Sprague, Stanton, Tenn.; Stanton, Ky.; Stevens, Stetson, Sweetzer, Thomas, Thompson, Mass.; Tuck, Underhill, Vandyke, Venable, Vinton, Waldo. Wallace, Wentworth, Whittlesey, Woodward.

Exclamations of rejoicing were heard on one side, and sorrow on the other.

Mr. Howard moved to reconsider the vote, but the Speaker decided that the motion having once been made could not be repealed.

Mr. Howard appealed; pending which the House adjourned, having killed the bill.

SEPTEMBER 6th.—The Senate after having acted on several private bills adjourned to Monday. In the House the Speaker announced the pending business.—On yesterday he said the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Howard, moved to reconsider the vote by which the House refused to order the Texas Boundary Bill to a third reading. The Chair at that time decided that the motion had once been made and agreed to. From this decision Mr. Howard has appealed. The Speaker this morning referred to various parliamentary authorities, and said that he adhered to his decision of yesterday.

Mr. Howard remarked that the only question was, is this the same bill which was reconsidered on a former occasion. The one was a bill to settle the Boundary of Texas, the other in addition provided for a territorial government for New Mexico, not the same, and different as night from day.

Mr. Inge said when an appeal was taken yesterday, he was recognized, and moved to lay the appeal on the table, and it was so reported in the *Globe*.

The Speaker replied that he did not recognize the gentleman, and no such motion appeared in the journal.

Mr. Howard wished to bring the attention of the House to the true point at issue, namely, whether this is the same proposition heretofore reconsidered. His object was if the motion prevailed, to move to strike out the discrimination between creditors, and give the right to Texas to manage payment in her own way, putting all creditors on the same basis. He moved the previous question.

Mr. Duer asked him to withdraw the motion.

Mr. Howard refused except on condition that Mr. Duer would renew the motion.

Mr. Duer moved to lay the appeal on the table. Decided in the negative—Yeas 77, Nays 123.

The Previous Question was seconded—Yeas 102, Nays 56. The question was then taken, shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House? and decided in the negative—Yeas 88, Nays 123. So the decision of the Chair was reversed. The question recurred on reconsidering the vote by which the House refused to order the bill to a third reading.

Mr. Howard would not occupy the time of the House and moved the previous question.

The question then recurred on ordering the bill to a third reading.

Mr Howard moved the Previous Question.

Mr. Wentworth earnestly appealed to Mr. Howard to withdraw the motion, but Mr. Howard refused, amid cries of "Hold on!"

Mr. Morris arose and asked the reading of the seventeenth rule, which was read, designating what persons only shall be entitled to the privilege of the floor. He desired its enforcement.

The Speaker replied, that the officers would attend to their duty.

It was said that many Texas bondolders were in the lobbies.

Mr. Wentworth again appealed to Mr. Howard without success to withdraw his motion for the Previous Question, which was shortly afterward seconded: Ayes 103, Nays 91,

The main question was ordered to be put—Yeas 115, Nays 91. The question was now on ordering the Bill, as amended yesterday, to a third reading. It was an exciting time, and much confusion prevailed. The galleries and lobbies were filled with anxious spectators. [Probably a misprint for speculators]. When the clerk commenced calling the roll the noise ceased, and seldom have we known so much quiet as now. The roll call concluded, there was a movement all over the hall. Votes were changed, and every proceeding watched with the utmost anxiety. When Mr. Howard, of Texas, was called and voted Ay, applause commenced, but was silenced promptly by the Speaker. But few members were in their seats—many had come into the area in front of the Clerk's table, and there was much sensation. The Speaker exerted himself vigorously to quell the disorder which had broken out afresh, and then commenced announcing the result, Ayes 107. He paused to give a gentlemen an opportunity to vote, when Mr. Burt made a point that no one could now vote as the affirmative vote had been proclaimed. The The Speaker overruled the question. The gentleman voted, and the Speaker announced in a firm and loud tone, *Yeas* 108, *Nays* 98. Immediately succeeding this clapping of hands, stamping and whistling in the galleries, and applause on the floor, Order, Order, resounded in every direction.

The Speaker knocked lustily with his hammer, and voices were heard saying, "Let them clap," "Order, Order."

Mr. Ashe, among the many voices, was heard asking, will it be in order to have the galleries cleared.

The Speaker—The House have the power to order it.

Mr. Featherson—The Chair has a right to direct the Sergeant-at-Arms to enforce order in the galleries.

The Speaker—The Chair has directed the Officers to enforce the rules at all times. Great confusion.

Mr. Ashe moved that the galleries be cleared. The excitement subsided.

The Speaker said the question is on the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. Holmes—Has the Bill been engrossed?

The Speaker—It has.

Mr. Duer moved to reconsider the vote.

The Speaker said it was not in order.

The Bill was read a third time.

Mr Thompson, of Penn., moved the previous question on its passage, which was seconded—Ayes 103, Nays 53.

The main question was ordered to be put.

Mr Burt moved to lay the Bill on the table. Disagreed to—Yeas 97, Nays 108.

The Bill was then passed—Yeas 107 Nays 97.

On motion of Mr. Thompson, of Penn., the motion to reconsider the vote was laid on the table. The title of the bill was amended by adding and "to establish a Territorial Government for New Mexico."

There was a disposition on the part of many gentlemen to take up the California Bill, and motions to adjourn were again interposed, one of which at 8 o'clock prevailed.

SEPTEMBER 7.—The House took up the California bill from the Senate.

Mr. Boyd moved Utah as an amendment.

Mr. Vinton raised a point of order.

The Chair was appealed to and the point sustained.

Mr. Vinton appealed.

A motion to lay the appeal on the table was lost by Yeas 88, Nays 116.

The decision of the Chair was overruled: Yeas 87, Nays 107. So the Utah amendment was declared out of order.

Mr. Thompson, Loco, of Miss., rose to move an amendment.

Mr. Meade. Loco, of Va., caused one to be read which he wished to offer. It was, in effect, that the owners of slaves shall have twelve months to remove them from the limits of California, and providing for the recovery of slaves who shall escape into that State.

The Speaker said it only could be offered by unanimous consent, while the gentleman from Miss., had the floor.

Mr. Thompson substitue for the bill was now read. It was similar to that of Mr. Soulé's in the Senate, viz: that as soon as California shall have passed an ordinance in convention relinquishing the right to a primary disposal of the soil &c., and restricting her boundary to 36 30, the President should without further action, issue his proclamation declaring California a State of the Union. The portion of revenue collected in California at the time of issuing the said proclamation shall be paid to that State, and the Senators and Representatives already elected shall be entitled to receive mileage and compensation from the time the California Constiution was received by Congress. The substitute provides for a Territorial Government to be called South California, similar to the Government of New Mexico, south of 36 30 to be admitted as a State hereafter, with or with or without Slavery, as the people may desire.

Mr. Orr, (Loco) of S. C. moved to amend the original bill; but as he could not do so, Mr. Thompson accepted it. It restricted the Southern limits of California to 36 deg 30 min.

Mr. Thompson, of Miss. then briefly advocated the amendment, saying that the limits of California were too large, and showing the gross outrage on the South, if it should not be adopted. It would be the means of restoring peace throughout the Union.

Mr. Richardson thought that the subject had been discussed long enough, and moved the previous question.

Mr. Holmes, (Loco) of S. C. unsuccessfully moved a call of the House.

The previous question was seconded.

Mr. McClernand raised the cry of "order," and observed that Mr. Thompson could not offer a substitute and an amendment at the same time.

The Speaker said that the objection came too late.

The question was taken on the amendment to restrict the California boundary to 36 deg. 30 min. and was disagreed to—Yeas, 75, Nays 132.

The question was now on Mr. Thompson's substitute, which was rejected—Yeas 71, Nays 134.

The question being on the third reading.

Mr. Holmes moved an adjournment, but not more than four or five members voted in the affirmative.

Mr. Thompson, of Miss. said that a decent respect for the House required the bill to be at least read.

The Senate bill for the admission of California was then read for information.

The third reading of the bill was then ordered—Yeas 151, Nays 56.

The bill having been read a third time,

Mr. Featherston, (Loco) of Miss. moved to lay it on the table, which was not agreed to.

The bill then passed by the following vote—Yeas 150 Nays 57.

YEAS—Messrs. Albertson, Alexander, Allen, Anderson, Andrews, Baker, Bay, Bennett, Bingham, Bissell, Bokee, Booth, Bowie, Bowlin, Breck, Briggs, Brooks, Brown, Indiana, Buel, Burrows, Butler, Penn, Butler, Conn; Cable, Ohio; Caldwell, N C; Calvin, Campbell, Cartter, Cassey, Chandler, Clark, Cole, Corwin, Crowell, Dickey, Dimmick, Disney, Dixon, Doty, Duer, Duncan, Durkee, Eliot, Evans, Md; Evans, Ohio; Ewing, Fitch, Fowler, Freedly, Fuller, Gentry, Gerry, Giddings, Gilmore, Gorman, Gott, Gould, Grinnell, Hall, Halloway, Hamilton, Harlan, Harris, Ill; Haymond, Henry, Hibbard, Hoagland, Houston, Howe, Hunter, Jackson, N Y; Johnson, Tenn; Johnson, Ky; Jones, Julian, Kerr, King, R I; King, N J; John A King, Preston King, Leffler, Levin, Littlefield, Mann, Mass; Mann, Penn; Marshall, Mason, Matteson, McClernand, McDonald, McGaughey, McKissock, McLanahan, McLane, Md; McLean, Ky; Meacham, Moore, Morehead, Morris, Nelson, Newall, Ogle, Olds, Otis, Peaslee, Peck, Phelps, Phœnix, Pitman, Potter, Putnam, Reed, Reynolds, Richardson, Robbins, Robinson, Root, Rose, Ross, Rumsey, Sackett, Sawtelle, Schenck, Schermerhorn, Schoolcraft, Silvester, Sprague, Stanley, Stevens, Penn; Thurman, Thompson, Ky; Tuck, Underhill, Van Dyke, Vinton, Walden, Waldo, Watkins, Wentworth, White, Whittlesey, Wildrick, Williams, Wilson and Young.

NAYS—Messrs. Alexander, Allen, Bennett, Bingham, Brown, Miss; Burrows, Burt, Butler, Conn; Cable, Ohio; Calvin, Campbell, Chandler, Clark, Colcock, Cole, Corwin, Crowell, Dickey, Dixon, Doty, Duer, Duncan, Durkee, Evans, Ohio; Featherston, Fitch, Fowler, Giddings, Gott, Gould, Halloway, Harlan, Harris, Ala; Hebard, Henry, Holladay, Holmes, Howe, Hubbard, Hunter, Inge, Jackson, N Y; Julian, King, R I; King, N J; John A. King, Preston King, Mann, Mass; Matison, McKissock, McMeachem, Meade, Moore, Morris, Nelson, Newall, Ogle, Sackett, Sawtelle, Schenck, Schoolcraft, Seddon, Silvester, Sprague, Stevens, Pa; Stetson, Sweetser, Taylor, Tuck, Van Dyke, Vinton, Waldo, Wallace, Wentworth, and Woodward.

A motion was made to reconsider the vote, but it was laid on the table.

The House then adjourned till Monday.

Miscellanea.

JENNY LIND.—The agreement between Jenny Lind, who arrived here last week, and Barnum is said by *The Tribune* to be as follows: The sum of $1,000 per night, for one hundred and fifty nights, will be secured to Mdlle. Lind, in addition to which the nett proceeds of every night will be divided equally between the parties. On the other hand, as an equivalent for this liberal offer on the part of Mr. Barnum, Mdlle. Lind has agreed to sing during her engagement in any part of Europe or America. It is probable that she will visit London during the Great Industrial Exhibition of 1851. She also binds herself to give Concerts in this City until the price of tickets shall be brought down to the minimum rate of $3, so that the fairest opportunity of hearing her shall be afforded the public.

ATROCIOUS ABDUCTION.—About two weeks since a man calling himself William Thompson, from Rancocas N. J., called at this office and stated that his wife —with her child, which was about eighteen months old—had suddenly disappeared, and that he feared she had been kidnapped. She had left him, he said about a week before, on a visit to some friends in the city, but not returning at the time fixed, he had become uneasy, and came to the city in pursuit of her. Here he learned that she had started for home two days before, allowing her time enough to have reached there before he left—and that his fears in regard to her were now increased. We did what we could to aid him in his search, but at the same time encouraged him to hope that he would yet find her among some of her friends. But in a few days afterwards we heard that the poor man's worst fears were confirmed by the receipt of a letter purporting to be from his wife, dated at Baltimore, stating that she had been taken to that city by her owner James S. Mitchell, and sold to J. S. Donovan, and that the said J. S. Donovan would be willing to sell her and her child to her friends for the sum of $1025. Two other letters were written, signed by J. S. Donovan, of the same purport and in the same hand writing.

This was the first intimation William Thompson ever had that his wife was a slave. He married her six years ago in Wilmington, Del., as a free woman, and as such he still regards her. Inquiries have been instituted, and it will soon be determined whether the woman is legally entitled to her freedom or not. If so, she may possibly be recovered from her captors by the forms of law and restored to her husband. If not, she must either be redeemed at the enormous price which the slave-trader demands for her and her child, or be allowed to pass along with the hundreds of other victims who are daily sent to the south to meet the demands of the man-market.

This Donovan is said to be the successor of the notorious Hope H. Slater.—*Pennsylvania Freeman.*

ARREST FOR ASSISTING SLAVES TO ESCAPE.—Some information was furnished, a few days ago, to the Police authorities here, which induced them to suspect that two runaway slaves were secreted on board the schooner Celerity, lately arrived at Rocketts from the Pamunkey River. On Friday last Officer Wilkerson overhauled the vessel, and discovered them both—one hid in the hold and the other in the cabin. The captain, J. J. Williamson, was immediately arrested, and with the negroes, lodged in jail. They were brought before the Mayor on Saturday, but the case was continued until Wednesday, to await the arrival of their masters in the city. One of the slaves belongs to J. H. Travis of Brunswick, and the other to Braxton Garlick of New Kent. We regret to learn that Williamson is a Virginian by birth. No doubt he was employed by Northern Abolitionists to commit these larcenies.—When entrusted to Col. Morgan's charge, he will probably find a congenial acquaintance in Mr. Smith, who lately preceded him for a similar offence.—*Richmond Whig.*

Captain Williams has since been examined, and remanded for trial in King William County.

PROFESSOR WEBSTER.

Execution of Prof. Webster—His letter to Rev. Dr. Parkman, &c. &c.

The following letter which we find in the *Boston Transcript*, was addressed by Prof. Webster to Rev. Dr. Parkman, brother of Dr. George Parkman. A copy of the letter was retained by Prof. W. and confided to a friend, with permission to make such use of it as he might see fit, after the execution:

BOSTON, Tuesday, August 6.

REV. DR. PARKMAN. Dear Sir.—I cannot leave this world in the peace of mind for which I pray, without addressing you as the head of that family which I have so deeply injured and afflicted, to make known to you and them the bitter anguish of soul, the sincere contrition and penitence I have felt at having been the cause of the affliction under which you and they have been called to mourn. I can offer no excuse for my wicked and fatal ebullition of passion but what you already know, nor would I attempt to palliate it.

I had never, until the two or three last interviews with your brother, felt towards him anything but gratitude for his many acts of kindness and friendship. That I should have allowed the feelings excited on those occasions to have overpowered me so as to involve the life of your brother, and my own temporal and eternal welfare, I can, even now, hardly realize.

I may not receive from you forgiveness in this world, yet I cannot but hope and believe you will think of me with compassion, and remember me in your prayers to Him who will not turn away from the humble and repentant. Had I many lives, with what joy would I lay them all down, to alleviate the affliction I have caused; but I can now only pray for forgiveness for myself and for every consolation and blessing upon every member of your family.

In justice to those dearest to me, I beg to assure you, and I entreat you to believe me, no one of my family had the slightest doubt of my entire innocence up to the moment when the contrary was communicated to them by Dr. Putnam That they have your sincere pity and sympathy I feel assured.

There is no family toward every member of which I have always felt a greater degree of respect and regard than that of which you are now the head. From more than one I have received repeated acts of friendship and kindness, for which I have ever been and am most truly grateful

Toward yourself in particular have not only my own feelings been those of the most sincere regard and gratitude, but every individual of my family has felt toward you that you were their pastor and friend. Often has my wife recalled the interest you took in her from her first becoming your parishioner, and often has she spoken, with feelings of gratitude, of the influence of your public ministrations and of your private instructions and conversations, and of your direction of her inquiries and reading in what related to her religious views. These she has often recalled and referred to as having firmly established the religious faith and trust which are now such sources of consolation and support to her and our children, as well as to myself.

Nothing that has occurred has weakened these feelings, and although those I leave behind me may not meet you without the keenest anguish, I trust you will exonerate them from any participation in or knowledge of the father's sin, up to the moment I have mentioned, and may you remember them in your prayers to the Father of the fatherless and the widow's God.

I beg you, my dear sir, to consider this strictly a private letter and by no means to give it publicity; at the same time I will request you to make known to the immediate members of your family the state of my feelings and contrition.

That every consolation and blessing may be vouchsafed to yourself and to every member of your family, is the heartfelt prayer of

Yours, most resp'y,
(Signed,) J. W. WEBSTER.

MARRIAGES.

WISE—EVERETT.—At Cambridge on the 27th ultimo, by the Rev. Dr. Frothingham, Lieut. Henry Augustus Wise, of the United States Navy, to Miss Charlotte Broors, daughter of Hon. Edward Everett.

WALTON—LINCOLN.—At Champion, New York, on the 27th ultimo, by the Rev. Samuel J. May, of Syracuse, Mr. George A. Walton, of Lawrence, Mass., to Miss Electa N. Lincoln, teacher in the West Newton State Normal School.

STOREY—WEBSTER.—In Middletown, Ct., August 28, John M. Storey, of Havana, to Caroline Augusta, youngest daughter of the late E. W. Webster, Esq., of the island of Cuba.

ROGERS—GRANT.—In Boston, August 26, George H. Rogers, of Baltimore, to Mary G., daughter of Moses Grant, Esq.

GILES—FORD.—In Abington, August 27, Mr. Jesse H. Giles, late of Sacramento City, and Editor of the "Placer Times," to Miss Louisa, daughter of Captain Daniel A. Ford, of A.

FOSTER—BALDWIN.—In New Haven, Aug. 10, Dwight Foster, Esq., of Worcester, to Miss Henrietta P., daughter of Hon. Roger S. Baldwin.

GASKELL—CARPENTER.—At Lewin's Mead Chapel, Bristol, England, by the Rev. Phillip P. Carpenter, of Warrington, Robert Gaskell, Esq., of Ashfield, near Warrington, to Susan, youngest daughter of the late Rev. Lant Carpenter, LL. D., of that city.

PACKARD—RICKETSON.—In New Bedford, August 27, by Rev. Mr. Welsh, Captain Henry Packard to Mrs. Sarah E. Ricketson.

DEATHS.

QUINCY.—On Sunday morning, September 1st., Mrs. Eliza Susan Quincy, aged 77, and for more than fifty-three years the wife of Hon. Josiah Quincy. Mrs. Quincy was a rare example of fidelity and devotedness in all the relations of life. The almost public position which she so long occupied se

Poetry.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

A MONTH IN THE CAPITOL—THE CONTRAST.

BY WM. J. WALKER.

'Twas evening.
And the last beams of the departing day
Tinged, with a feeble light, the domes and spires
That, proudly towering, reared themselves above
The City of a Nation's hopes.
Among those domes, that thus reflected back
"The last faint glimmer of departing day,"
Stood one, apart, far prouder than the rest;
Gloomy and grand, it stood, and from its top
A starry flag waved forth upon the Night:
And see—a multitude has gathered round
That bannered dome; and in the mighty throng
Each eye seems eager, and each tongue is hushed;
And eagerly they gaze upon the form
Of one, who, coming forth, announces, hark!
"There is no change."
Each head is bowed in sad and silent grief;
Within, a Nation's Chief is struck by death;
And round his dying couch, anxious and sorrowful,
That Nation's children gather.

'Tis midnight.
Darkness broods o'er the scene; the multitude
Have all dispersed, sadly and silently,
And He! around whose dying couch they came,
Calmly and quietly had passed away.
Upon the "lightning's track" the message speeds
Far o'er the land; many there be that watch,
In every city; and as the tidings come,
Slowly and solemnly each one retires;
And they are mourners all.

'Tis morn.
Brightly and sweetly shines the morning sun;
The morning breeze waves proudly forth that flag,
And through the city rings the busy "note
Of preparation" for a coming pageant
Beneath that dome, rulers and mighty men
Are gathered; from among them one stands forth
To take the honored place of him who lies
Lifeless and cold, in gloomy state.
The oath is sworn, and, lo! the Chair of State
Once more is filled.

* * * * * * *

A month has passed away, and now again 'tis night;
Again the last beams of the setting sun
Illuminate those spires; again the folds
Of that proud flag are gaily borne in air;
But now the dark pall which before had hung
Over the Capitol was there no more.
Up from the crowded street rose shout and laugh,
And many a sound of mirth and reckless glee:
And music, too, from halls of luxury,
Stole forth upon the balmy evening air,
And gentle breezes bore it off to heaven;
But, mingling with its most voluptuous swells—
That rose from halls where rang the gayest laugh,
Where tripped the lightest foot in giddiest dance—
Went up to heaven a wail of sad despair.
Oh! there were hearts that pined in misery:
Oh! there were bosoms longing to be free.
In that sad wail was heard the bitter cry
Of fathers, from their helpless children torn,
Of mothers o'er their babes; inheriting
A life of degradation, toil and shame—
The prayer for freedom, mingling with the curse
Of hate, and imprecation for revenge.
Within a little room, a group of men
Had gathered—men whose dusky bosoms glowed
With all that generous fire which men applaud,
When, kindling heroes' hearts, it nerves their arms
To daring deeds, perchance to deeds of blood—
And with them there is one who comes to wrest
His victims from the haughty spoiler's grasp.

'Tis midnight.
Change we the scene: the stars shine dimly down
Upon a road deserted, save a group
Of whispering men, who seem like bandits there
Waiting the coming of expected prey.
Hark! 'tis the sound of wheels; they're coming now.
Crouched in the gloom, each one prepares his arms.
Secure, the victims carelessly approach,
The song of new-found freedom on their lips.

* * * * * * *

A clash of gleaming knives—a storm of blows—
A shower of leaden rain—a struggle fierce.

* * * * * * *

The fight is past, and with it passed away
Their dream of happiness. An hour ago,
And they were men, and now they wear the yoke
Of Slavery, so lately cast aside.
Bleeding and faint, yet firmly bound, they stand,
Save one, who, wounded, yet disdaining death,
Seeing all lost, sprang on his enemies,
And, madly dashing them aside, escaped,
A fugitive;
And with them, bound and bleeding like the rest,
He stands who would have rescued them from bonds.
Oh, who can tell the anguish of his heart?
He periled all to save them—all was lost.

'Tis morn.
Again the morning sun illuminates
Those domes and spires; again the starry flag
Waves forth as freely on the breeze of morn
As if that breeze fanned not the brows of slaves.
The news spreads forth upon the "lightning's track,"
"*Slave-stealer* caught," thousands take up the cry;
"*Slave-stealer* caught," it echoes through the land.
Ho! monarch-ridden Europe, bend the knee.
And bow the head, in reverence profound;
Bring boughs of laurel—wreathe each stripe and star
Of your proud flag—the flag of freedom's hosts.
Come, Ethiopia, in submission come,
And bring your laurel too, and wreathe the chains
That gall your bleeding limbs;
Remember they are only "cords of love,"
To draw you into light and liberty.
CHAPLIN! for thee we shed no mournful tears,
For thou hast only earned a noble fame,
A fame of which the proudest might be proud;
But to our brothers who have never known
The joy of liberty, whose limbs have borne
The chains, whose backs have felt the cruel scourge,
To them we pledge our heartfelt sympathy;
And to the tyrants proud who riveted
Their chains, who to their groans and pleading prayers
Have listened not, but, in their lust for power,
Have crushed them lower still, to them we
Our pity pledge for their doom, that hasteth on.

UTICA, *Aug. 20th.* 1850.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

THE FUGITIVE SLAVE.

BY MISS ANNA T. G. PHILLIPS.

Surrender the slave?
No, never, by God!
He stands with the brave
On Freedom's own sod.
His servitude's o'er
By Heaven's decree—
A bondman no more—
Like us, he is free!

Surrender him—why?
That he may go back
With one who 'll apply
The lash to his back—
That he may once more
Be fetter'd with chains,
And welter in gore,
And suffer with pains!

Surrender him? No!
Though myriads oppose,
Through weal and through woe
We 'll challenge his foes!

He sounds the alarm!
We answer the call;
We 'll shield him from harm,
Whatever befall.

Surrender the slave?
No, never, by God!
He's now with the brave
On Freedom's own sod!
His servitude 's o'er,
He lives with the free—
A bondman no more,
A Freeman is he!

Miscellany.

PATRICK HENRY.

THE following is from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Alexander, of Princeton Seminary:

From my earliest chilhood I had been accustomed to hear of the eloquence of Patrick Henry. On this subject there existed but one opinion in the country. The power of his eloquence was felt equally by the learned and the unlearned. No man who ever heard him speak, on any important occasion, could fail to admit his power over the minds of his hearers. The occasions on which he made his greatest efforts have been recorded by Mr. White, in his life of Henry.—What I propose in this brief article is to mention only what I observed myself more than half a century ago. Being then a young man just entering on a profession in which good speaking was very important, it was natural for me to observe the oratory of celebrated men. I was anxious to ascertain the true secret of their power; or what it was which enabled them to sway the minds of their hearers almost at their will.

In executing a mission from the Synod of Virginia, in 1794, I had to pass through the county of Prince Edward, where Mr. Henry resided. Understanding that he was to appear before the Circuit Court which met in that county, in defence of three men charged with murder, I determined to seize the opportunity of observing for myself the eloquence of this extraordinary orator.

It was with some difficulty that I obtained a seat in front of the bar, where I could have a full view of the speaker, as well as hear him distinctly.—But I had to submit to a severe penance in gratifying my curiosity; for the whole day was occupied with the examination of two witnesses, in which Mr. Henry was aided by two other lawyers.

In person, Mr. Henry was lean rather than fleshy. He was rather above than below the common height, but had a stoop in his shoulders which prevented him from appearing as tall as he really was. In his moments of animation, he had a habit of straightening his frame, and adding to his apparent stature. He wore a brown wig, which exhibited no indication of any great care in the dressing. Over his shoulders he wore a brown camlet cloak.—Under this his clothing was black, something of the worse for wear. The expression of his countenance was that of solemnity and deep earnestness. His mind appeared to be always absorbed in what, for the time, occupied his attention. His forehead was high and spacious, and the skin of his face more than usually wrinkled for a man of fifty. His eyes were small and deeply set in his head, but were of a bright blue color, and twinkled much in their sockets. In short, Mr. Henry's appearance had nothing very remarkable as he sat at rest. You might readily have mistaken him for a common planter, who cared very little about his personal appearance. In his manners he was uniformly respectful and courteous.—Candles were brought into the court-house, when the examination of the witnesses closed; and the judges put it to the option of the bar, whether they would go on with the argument that night, or adjourn until the next day. Paul Carrington, Jr., the attorney for the State, a man of large size and uncommon dignity of person and manner, as also an accomplised lawyer, professed his willingness to proceed immediately, whilst the testimony was fresh in the minds of all. Now for the first time I heard Mr. Henry make anything of a speech, and though it was short, it satisfied me of one thing, which I had particularly desired to have decided; namely, whether, like a player, he merely assumed the appearance of feeling. His manner of addressing the court was profoundly respectful. He would be willing to proceed with the trial, but, said he, "My heart is so oppressed with the weight of responsibility that rests upon me, having the lives of three fellow-citizens depending, probably, on the exertion I may be able to make in their behalf, (here he turned to the prisoners behind him,) that I do not feel able to proceed to-night. I hope the court will indulge me, and postpone the trial till morning." The impression made by these few words was such as I assure myself no one can ever conceive by seeing them in print. In the countenance, action, and intonation of the speaker, there was expressed such an intensity of feeling, that all my doubts were dispelled; never again did I question whether Henry felt, or only acted a feeling. Indeed, I experienced an instantaneous sympathy with him in the emotions which he expressed; and I have no doubt the same sympathy was felt by every hearer.

As a matter of course, the proceedings were deferred till the next morning, I was early at my post: the judges were soon on the bench and the prisoners at the bar. Mr. Carrington—afterwards Judge Carrington—opened with a clear and dignified speech, and presented the evidence to the jury.—Everything seemed perfectly plain. Two brothers and a brother-in-law met two other persons in pursuit of a slave, supposed to be harbored by the brothers. After some altercation and mutual abuse one of the brothers, whose name was John Ford, raised a loaded gun which he was carrying, and, presenting it to the breast of one of the other pair, shot him dead in open day. There was no doubt about the fact. Indeed, it was not denied. There had been no other provocation than opprobrious words. It is presumed that the opinion of every juror was made up from merely hearing the testimony; as Tom Harvey the principal witness, who was acting as a constable on the occasion, appeared to be a respectable man. For the clearer understanding of what follows, it must be observed that the said constable, in order to distinguish him from another of the name, was commonly called "Butterwood Harvey," as he lived on Butterwood Creek.

As he descanted on the evidence, he would often turn to Tom Harvey—a large, bold-looking man—and with the most sarcastic look would call him by some name of contempt; "this Butterwood Tom Harvey," "this *would-be-constable*," etc. By such expressions, his contempt for the man was communicated to the hearers. I own I felt it gaining on me in spite of my better judgment; so that before he was done the impression was so strong on my mind that Butterwood Harvey was undeserving of the smallest credit. This impression, however, I found I could counteract, the moment I had time for reflection. The only part of the speech in which he manifested his power of touching the feelings strongly, was where he dwelt on the irruption of the company into Ford's house, in circumstances so perilous to the solitary wife. This appeal to the sensibility of husbands—and he knew that all the jury stood in this relation—was overwhelming. If the verdict could have been rendered immediately after this burst of the pathetic, every man, at least every husband in the house, would have been for rejecting Harvey's testimony, if not for hanging him forthwith. It is fortunate that the the illusion of such eloquence is transient, and is soon dissipated by the exercise of sober reason. I confess, however, nothing which I then heard so convinced me of the advocate's power, as the speech of five minutes which he made when he requested that the trial might be postponed till the next day.

In addition to this, it so happened that I heard the last speech which Mr. Henry ever made. It was delivered at Charlotte, from the portico of the court-house, to an assembly in the open air. In the American edition of the New Edinburgh Encyclopedia, an account of this speech and its effects is given, so charged with exaggeration as to be grossly incorrect.

There is more truth in the statements contained in Mr. Wirt's memoir. In point of fact, the performance had little impression beyond the transient pleasure afforded to the friends of the administration, and the pain inflicted on the anti-federalists, his former political friends. Mr. Henry came to the place with difficulty, and was plainly destitute of his wonted vigor and commanding power. The speech was nevertheless a noble effort, such as could have proceeded from none but a patriotic heart. In the course of his remarks, Mr. Henry, (as is correctly stated by Mr. Wirt,) after speaking of Washington at the head of a numerous and well-appointed army, exclaimed—"And where is the American who will dare to lift his hand against the father of his country, to point a weapon at the breast of the man who has so often led them to battle and to victory?" An intoxicated man cried, "I could." "No!" answered Mr. Henry, rising aloft in all his majesty, and in a voice most solemn and penetrating, "No! you durst not do it; in such a parracidal attempt, the steel would drop from your nerveless arm!"

Mr. Henry was followed by a speaker afterwards noted in our national history; I mean John Randolph, of Roanoke; but the aged orator did not remain to witness the debut of his young opponent. Randolph began by saying that he had admired that man more than any on whom the sun had shone, but that now he was constrained to differ with him *toto cælo*. But Randolph was suffering with the hoarseness of a cold, and could scarcely utter an audible sentence. All that is alleged in the Encyclopedia, about Henry's returning to the platform, and replying with extraordinary effect, is pure fabrication. The fact is as above stated. Henry returned to his house, as if unwilling to listen, and requested a friend to report to him anything which might require an answer. But he made no reply, or did he again present himself to the people. I was amidst the crowd, standing near to Creed Taylor then an eminent lawyer, and afterwards a judge; who made remarks to those around him during the speech, declaring, among other things, that the old man was in his dotage. It is much to be regretted that a statement so untrue should be perpetuated in a work of such value and celebrity.

Patrick Henry had several sisters, with one of whom, the wife of Col. Meredith, of New Glasgow, I was acquainted. Mrs. Meredith was not only a woman of unfeigned piety, but was in my judgment as eloquent as her brother; nor have I ever met with a lady who equalled her in powers of conversation.

At an early period of my ministry, it became my duty to preach the funeral sermon of Mr. James Hunt, the father of the late Rev. James Hunt, of Montgomery county, Maryland. The death occurred at the house of a son who lived on Stanton river; Mr. Henry's residence, Red Hill, was a few miles distant, on the same river. Having been long a friend of the deceased, Mr. Henry attended the funeral, and remained to dine with the company, on which occasion I was introduced to him by Captain William Craighead, who had been an elder in President Davies' church. These gentlemen had been friends in Hanover, but had not met for many years. The two old gentlemen met with great cordiality, and seemed to have high enjoyment in talking of old times.

On the retrospect of so many years, I may be permitted to express my views of the extraordinary effects of Henry's eloquence. The remark is obvious, in application not only to him but to all great orators, that we cannot ascribe these effects merely to their intellectual conceptions, or their cogent reasonings, however great; these conceptions and reasons, when put on paper, often fall dead. They are often inferior to the arguments of men whose utterances have little impression. It has indeed been often said, both of Whitefield and of Henry, that their discourses, when reduced to writing, show poorly by the side of men who are no orators. Let me illustrate this, by the testimony of one whom I remember as a friend of my youth. General Posey was a revolutionary officer, who was second in command, under Wayne, in the expedition against the Indians; a man of observation and cool judgment. He was in attendance on the debates of that convention in which there were so many displays of deliberative eloquence. He assured me that after the hearing of Patrick Henry's most celebrated speech in that body, he felt himself as fully persuaded that the constitution as adopted would be our ruin, as of his own existence. Yet subsequent reflection restored his former judgment, and his well-considered opinion resumed its place.

The power of Henry's eloquence was due, first, to the greatness of his emotion and passion, accompanied with a versatility which enabled him to assume at once any emotion or passion which was suited to his ends. Not less indispensable, secondly, was a matchless perfection of the organs of expression, including the entire apparatus of voice, intonation, pause gesture, attitude, and indscribable play of countenance. In no instance did he ever indulge in an expression that was not instantly recognized as nature itself, yet some of his penetrating and subduing tones were absolutely peculiar, and as inimitable as they were indescribable. These were felt by every hearer in all their force. His mightiest feelings were sometimes indicated and communicated by a long pause, aided by an eloquent aspect, and some significant use of his finger. The sympathy between mind and mind is inexplicable. Where the channels of communication are open, the faculty revealing inward passion great and the expression of it sudden and visible, the effects are extraordinary. Let these shocks of influence be repeated again and again, and all other opinions and ideas are for the moment excluded; the whole mind is brought into a unison with that of the speaker; and the spell-bound listener, till the cause ceases, is under an entire fascination. Then, perhaps, the charm ceases, upon reflection, and the infatuated hearer resumes his ordinary state.

Patrick Henry, of course, owed much to his singular insight into the feelings of the common mind. In great cases he scanned his jury, and formed his mental estimate; on this basis he founded his appeal to their predilections and character. It is what other advocates do in a lesser degree.

When he knew that there were conscientious or religious men among the jury, he would most solemnly address himself to their sense of right, and would adroitly bring in Scriptural citations. If this handle was not offered, he would lay bare the sensibility of patriotism. Thus it was, when he succeeded in rescuing the man who had deliberately shot down a neighbour; who, moreover, lay under the odious suspicion of being a tory, and was proved to have refused supplies to a brigade of the American army.

A learned and intelligent gentleman stated to me that he once heard Mr. Henry's defence of a man arraigned for a capital crime. So clear and abundant was the evidence that my informant was unable to conceive any grounds of defence, especially after the law had been placed before the jury by the attorney for the commonwealth. For a long time after Henry began, he never once adverted to the merits of the case or the arguments of the prosecution, but went off into a most captivating and discursive oration on general topics, expressing opinions in perfect accordance with those of his hearers until, having fully succeeded in obliterating every impression of his opponents speech, he obliquely approached the subject, and as occasion was offered, dealt forth strokes which seemed to tell upon the minds of the jury. In this case, it should be added, the cause of truth prevailed over the art of the consummate orator.—*Princeton Magazine.*

THE SAINTS AND THE PEOPLE.

THE piety of some people is really astounding, and they take such enormous pains to let all the world know it, that the less enlighted in spiritual matters scarcely know whether they stand on their heads or their heels. And what with one thing, and what with another, this Christianity of ours is made to be a sad jumble of conflicting opinions and prejudices; and, to add to the confusion, in the midst of them all we have the narrowest views blended with the most sacred ones—the purest motives challenged and weakened by the bigotry and perversity of a set of men who are perpetually vexing and embroiling the community by their clamorous attempts to dictate rules of conduct to the majority. Heaven knows, none of us are half good enough; but it is too bad to have our sins violently thrust in our faces, and ourselves reproved, by a parcel of fellows, one half of whom are canting knaves, and the other blind, crazy enthusiasts. If we must receive dictation, let it come from a pure source—let hypocrisy not pollute the channel through which it is conveyed; and, above all, let it be tempered by reason and common sense, and so accommodated to existing circumstances that, while it aims at reconciling differences, it will not provoke either ill feeling or animosities. We are not disposed to be angry with the individuals to whom we would refer, but, from experience, we have found a mild tone of expostulation to be perfectly useless with them; there is something in their intelligence and principle which repels gentle reproaches, and therefore we are forced to deal with the class as they deserve, taking the bare merits of their professions and pretensions as our guides. Fanaticism in all shapes is dangerous, but when associated with religion, becomes mischievous and intolerant. It encourages the worst tendencies of our nature, and, from time immemorial, has served as a screen to the gratification of the vilest propensities. Now, if we take the class of persons who are laboring might and main for what they call the better observance of the Sabbath, we shall find them all to be more or less upholders of this radical moral error. Finding this to be the case, we are entitled to inquire more minutely into the general character of the persons who are desirous of toiling our consciences with an unctious sanctity, manufactured to order by the Agnews and Ashleys of the day. And if we do so, we shall find that they belong to every rank in life, and whether in the shape of a cobbler or a peer expound their views with the same fervor, the same spirit, and the same style of language, flavored by the trite but highly-seasoned phrases of religious enthusiasm. There is a dogmatism about them which savors of arrogant presumption, and when opposed they become violent and intolerant. Not satisfied with moderate influence, they aspire to the empire of public opinion, and each sect with maniac energy strives to make proselytes. Pretending to a piety of which, in practice, they are but poor exponents, they claim the right to lecture all less ascetically inclined, and would have it believed by all men that they are the commanders appointed to lead an ungodly race out of the thorny paths of iniquity. Imbued with the righteous over-much feeling, they demand precedence in matters of faith and duty, and lavish their remonstrances and entreaties with a liberality that we are afraid only betokens their cheapness, and the little loss suffered by their distribution. With many of them the most innocent recreations are heinous offences, and everything in the shape of amusement, and recreation is proscribed. The drama, the theatre, the concert-room, the tea-garden, are but so many snares of the evil one; and as to singing or dancing, the soul of a rigid Sabbatarian wriggles in his prim body at the very thought of such abominations. From such very saintly people it is only natural that a good deal should be expected; that they should be meek and exemplary in their general conduct, regular in their habits, candid, straightforward, and as generous as the lightgiving sun itself. Many are so; they are the boast and the glory of our common nature—they rank with the true apostles of the day; but the great majority are not, and from our own experience we can venture to assert that, in innumerable instances, they can be found to be mean, false, greedy, and sordid; prone to jealousies—envy; and in their anger as spiteful as cats. And to confirm us in our dislike of men who pretend to be better than their neighbors, we have before us the appalling fact that some of our most atrocious criminals were almost furious in their religious zeal. Rush delighted in prayer; the monster now under sentence of death in Scotland was a class-leader—he always had a goodly army of holy words at his command; the vagabond in Birmingham who decoyed a young girl from her virtuous home, was her spiritual adviser; and scores of those deplorably fallen people who are prosecuted for obscenity and still blacker offences, held office in the capacity of religious teacher; and it is notorious, as every jail chaplain can affirm, that the most depraved are those who can pray with the greatest fluency. So that prayer or any other outward sign of a well-regulated mind is not an infallible test of worth, and we turn with disgust from the man who could seek to be thought better than another because he sheltered himself behind a mass of gloomy forms and ceremonies. No men are keener at driving a bargain than your religious ones, and if we glance at our Bible and missionary societies we find a spirit of speculation, a meanness, and a parsimony which finds snug places for the elect few, and grinds to the very dust those whom hard necessity compels to labor for them. The very Bible that is given away is procured at starvation prices, and in the whole system of management, policy, and tendency of these societies we detect the presence of something repulsive to our higher notions of good, and incompatible with the reputation they have obtained. We have no confidence in your Simon Pures; they are hollow and deceitful all of them, and we hope the people of this country will not for a moment tolerate their Sabbatarian prejudices—we might consistently say frenzies. Sunday is the only day of rest allowed to the working-man, and it is unjust to restrain him in his legitimate enjoyment of it. No honest man would wish it otherwise than orderly and decently kept; but the wants and requirements of modern society necessitate the allowance of a less strict rule than that which might have suited a primitive New England colony. These are the days of persuasion, and it would now be about as possible to compel the whole community to attend church or chapel on a Sunday as it would be to brain a hard-headed bigot with a lady's fan. The thing is impossible, and consequently the question is made to assume a number of features which insist upon recognition. In the first place, Sunday is the only holiday the workigman can enjoy, and to say that the man who has toiled hard through the week shall be denied a little, harmless relaxation on one day—the only one at his disposal in this money-making age—is arrant nonsense, for no working man would submit to such restraint on his personal liberty; and, as he has numbers on his side, we know well who would go to the wall first were such an attempt made. Give back to the working men of England the holidays of which they have been robbed, before you ask him to be devout on the Sabbath-day. Give him, ye saints, bread; bestow upon him something more substantial than exhortations to be pious, before you place him twice or thrice on the Sunday inside a building filled with a pestilential atmosphere, or confine him to the narrow walls of his humble home. Give him justice, fair play, and a sound education, and he would then be in a better position to comport himself in all things as a man and a Christian.

But as regards the great body of the people, any tight-lacing cant will not prevail for a single hour. Coercion in the present day is as futile as baying at the moon; and the whole matter, when attentively considered, wears rather a ridiculous aspect; for if the saintly ladies and gentlemen who object to a working man, with his wife and family, taking a jaunt on a Sunday to breathe God's fresh air in some quiet lane or wide-spreading common, strictly carried out their spoken views they would not do many things themselves which at present they are obliged to do. Eating and drinking is work,—and pretty hard work, too, with some people. Now the saintly tribe are proverbial for their fondness of the good things of the earth, and when did one of them ever refuse to partake of some four meals, garnished with a tolerable lunch, on what they, with a freedom that is nauseous, term the Lord's-day? Dressing, too, is labor; shaving, a task that requires skill and patience, and sorely tries the temper; and yet, if we are to follow the letter of the law as laid down by this fraternity of fanatics, nothing of this kind ought to be done. Saturday is the proper day of preparation for the solemnities of Sunday, and for four-and-twenty hours we should all of us torture our bodies for the salvation of our souls. Even the tom cat should be placed under lock and key, and the poultry so judiciously separated that in time they would be able to distinguish Sunday from the remaining portion of septennial time.

But to conclude. The very absurdity of the proposal ought to be sufficient to banish it from sober consideration; and unless we are very poor prophets indeed, the recent postal regulations will give it the death-blow. John Bull will have his letters and newspapers delivered on a Sunday; and he is not so far gone in his religious lunacy to endure the cruel infliction of their detention much longer.—*London Weekly Times.*

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

An occurence has unfortunately taken place at Nottingham, which seems very likely to show the absurdity of capital punishment in all cases of murder. On Friday last a child, of ten years of age, wilfully drowned his brother, aged fourteen months. He has given two contradictory accounts of the death in exculpation of himself. He is, therfore, conscious of a wrong act. In all probability he will be tried for murder, and English lawyers and judges will argue from the conflicting excuses, that this precocious assassin was perfectly aware of the enormity of his crime at the time of commission, and possessed what Judge Blackstone calls "a mischievous discretion," and having done so, they will infer the necessary malice, and argue that he took the poor infant out of his father's house, and led him to the river side for the purpose of murder. It is equally probable that the jury will convict him, when sentence of death must be pronounced as a matter of course. If the abettors of legal and judicial homicide be consistent in their principles, they will hang this infant of ten years, as an "example of terror" to all persons, old or young, and in their profound ignorance of the Hebrew text, flatter themselves that they are fulfilling the Divine command to shed the blood of him that has shed man's blood.

This murder, for such until the inquest has been held it must unquestionable be considered, is not unique, nor are executions of mere infants on the gallows of rare occurrence in civilized England, which has inflicted the capital penalty on more people, and has, in consequence, had more murders than any country in Europe, except Spain and, perhaps, Italy. The following records of our extreme folly and barbarism are collected by Sir William Blackstone:—

In these cases our maxim is that 'malitia supplet ætatem.' Under seven years of age, indeed, an infant cannot be guilty of felony; for then a felonious discretion is almost an impossibility in nature; but at eight years old he may be guilty of felony. Also, under fourteen, though an infant shall be 'prima facie' adjudged to be 'doli incapax,' yet if it appear to the court and jury that he was 'doli capax,' and could distinguish between good and evil, he may be convicted and suffer death. Thus, a girl of thirteen has been burnt for murdering her mistress; and one boy of ten and another of nine years old, who had killed their companions, have been sentenced to death, and he of ten years actually hanged; because it appeared upon their trials that the one hid himself, and the other hid the body he had killed, which hiding manifested a consciousness of guilt, and a discretion to discern between good and evil. And there was an instance in the last century, where a boy of eight years old was tried at Abingdon for firing two barns; and it appearing that he had malice, revenge, and cunning, he was found guilty, condemned, and hanged accordingly. Thus, also, in very modern times, a boy of ten years old was convicted on his own confession of murdering his bed-fellow; there appearing in his whole behavior plain tokens of a mischevous discretion, and as the sparing of this boy merely on account of his tender years might be of dangerous consequence to the public, by propagating a notion that children might commit such atrocious crimes with impunity, it was unanimously agreed by all the judges that he was a proper subject of capital punishment."

Such is the wise law and practice of England. It is strange that Blackstone should have forgotten that of the eight persons who were hanged at Tyburn, Feb. 11, 1751, three were children—one for some depredation in the street, and the other two for "burglaries!" Dr. Taylor, in his "Letter on the Spy System at Boltonle-Moors," mentions that several persons were hanged at Lancaster for riot and felony in 1813, one of whom, an "idiot boy, was so young and childish, that on the scaffold he cried out for his mother, thinking she had the power to save him."—We might enumerate several other instances of the revolting barbarity which has been practised in this country under the maxim, that "Malice supplies the defect of age," but the above are sufficient to show what may be expected. A country in which such a deed of horror could be perpetrated as the dragging of a young girl to the gallows by six men, without amending its vicious and vitiating practice, is capable of any atrocity.

We can believe that the young felons enumerated above, possessed that mischievous discretion, which is necessary to satisfy the law and the judge, but that any one of them had that knowledge of the enormity of murder and arson, which alone will satisfy a rational man that they were on a level with adult murderers and incendiaries, we may very well doubt. Had the law been devised by Draco himself, it could not be more profoundly regardless of just distinctions in regard to persons.

We have no doubt that all the cases mentioned by Judge Blackstone were cases of insanity—a disease which our judges, of all men that can read and write, are least able to understand. Baron Alderson could not perceive the insanity of Mr. Pate; he could not so much as comprehend the decisive evidence given by the experienced Dr. Munro. The condemnation and execution of William Crouch, a few years ago, who in a paroxysm of lunacy killed his wife, affords another proof of the inability of English judges to deal properly with questions concerning the state of another person's reason. Bellingham, who was hanged for shooting Mr. Perceval in 1812, in a manner which none but confirmed madmen adopt, was held by Lord Mansfield to be perfectly in his senses, because among other curious and weaker reasons "he had gone out like another man; he came up to London by himself at Christmas; he was under no restraint; no medical man had attended him to cure his malady; and he was regular in all his habits." Professional psychologists know very well that murder, attempts at suicide, and other violent acts, are frequently the first overt indications of insanity; and for this reason, and the singular inaptitude of criminal judges to comprehend the existence of the malady in any other form than that which is described in law books, we ought, in all cases of murder to subject the prisoner to scientific examination, before putting him on his trial. This course is followed in France, and, we believe, in Belgium. It is found to be of admirable use. Both judge and jury are then quite assured that the accused is perfectly sane and the former is saved from the risk of making himself laughed at by talking on a subject of which he has no knowledge, and in opposition to competent medical opinion. The case of the child at Nottingham offers an opportunity for adopting this French improvement at once. We are confident that it will be found, that though he did give false accounts to exculpate himself, he has not that knowledge of the heinousness of murder which can alone be held sufficient for conviction, where reason, and not prejudice for the saws of law books, is consulted.—*London Morning Advertiser.*

DESCRIPTION OF A HOT DAY.

Now the rosy- (and lazy-) fingered Aurora, issuing form her saffron house, calls up the moist vapors to surround her, and goes veiled with them as long as she can; till Phœbus, coming forth in his power, looks everything out of the sky, and holds sharp uninterrupted empire from his throne of beams. Now the mower begins to make his sweeping cuts more slowly, and resorts oftener to the beer. Now the carter sleeps a-top of his load of hay, or plods with double slouch of shoulder, looking out with eyes winking under his shading hat, and with a hitch upward of one side of his mouth. Now the little girl at her grandmother's cottage door watches the coaches that go by, with her hand held up over her sunny forehead. Now laborers look well, resting in their white shirts at the doors of rural alehouses. Now an elm is fine there, with a seat under it; and horses drink out of the trough, stretching necks with loosened collars; and the traveller calls for his glass of ale, having been without one for more than ten minutes; and his horse stands wincing at the flies, giving sharp shivers of his skin, and moving to and fro his ineffectual docked tail; and now Miss Betsy Wilson, the host's daughter, comes streaming forth in a flowered gown and ear-rings, carrying with four of her beautiful fingers the foaming glass, for which, after the traveller has drank it, she receives, with an indifferent eye, looking another way, the lawful two-pence; that is to say, unless the traveller, nodding his ruddy face, pays some gallant compliment to her before he drinks it, such as "I'd rather kiss you, my dear, than the tumbler,"—or "I'll wait for you, my love, if you'll marry me;" upon which, if the man is good-looking and the lady in good humor, she smiles, and bites her lips, and says, "Ah—men can talk fast enough; upon which the old stage coachman, who is ouckling something near her before he sets off, says in a horse voice, "So can women too for that matter," and John Boots grins through his ragged red locks, and doats on the repartee all the day after. Now gra-shoppers "fry," as Dryden says. Now cattle stand in water, and ducks are envied. Now boots and shoes and trees by the road side, are thick with dust; and dogs, rolling in it, after issuing out of the water, into which they have been thrown to fetch sticks, come scattering horror among the legs of the spectators. Now a fellow who finds he has three miles further to go in a pair of tight shoes, is in a pretty situation. Now rooms with the sun upon them become intolerable; and the apothecary's apprentice, with a bitterness beyond aloes, thinks of the pond he used to bath in at school.—Now men with powdered heads, (especially if thick) envy those that are unpowdered, and stop to wipe them up hill, with countenances that seem to expostulate with destiny. Now boys assemble round the village pump with a ladle to it, and delight to make a forbidden splash and get wet through the shoes. Now also they make suckers of leather, and bathe all day long in rivers and ponds, and follow the fish into their cool corners, and say millions of "My eyes!" at "little-bats." Now the bee, as it hums along, seems to be talking heavily of the heat. Now doors and brick walls are burning to the hand; and a walled lane, with dust and broken bottles in it, near a brick field, is a thing not to be thought of. Now a green lane, on the contrary, thick set with hedge-row elms, and having the noise of a brook "rumbling in pebble-stone," is one of the pleasantest things in the world. Now youths and damsels walk through hay fields, by chance; and the latter say, "Ha' done then William;" and the overseer in the next field calls out to "let thic thear hay thear bide;" and the girls persist, merely to plague "such a frumpish old fellow."

Now, in town, gyssips talk more than ever to one another, in rooms, in door-ways, and out of window, always beginning the conversation with saying that the heat is overpowering. Now blinds are let down, and doors thrown open, and flannel waistcoats left off, and cold meat preferred to hot, and wonder expressed why tea continues so refreshing, and people delight to sliver lettuces into bowls, and apprentices water doorways with tin cannisters that lay several atoms of dust. Now, the water-cart, jumbling along the middle of the street, and jolting the showers out of its box of water, really does something. Now boys delight to have a water-pipe let out, and see it bubbling away in a tall and frothy volume. Now fruiterers' shops and dairies look pleasant, and ices are the only things to those who can get them. Now ladies loiter in baths; and people make presents of flowers; and wine is put into ice; and the after-dinner lounger recreates his head with applications of perfumed water out of long necked bottles. Now the lounger, who cannot resist riding his new horse, feels his boots burn him. Now buckskins are not the lawn of Cos. Now jockies, walking in great coats to lose flesh, curse inwardly. Now five fat people in a stage coach, hate the sixth fat one who is coming in, and think he has no right to be so large. Now clerks in offices do nothing but drink soda water and spruce beer, and read the newspaper. Now the old clothes man drops his solitary cry more deeply into the areas on the hot and forsaken side of the street; and bakers look vicious; and cooks are aggravated: and the steam of a tavern kitchen catches hold of one like the breath of Tartarus. Now delicate skins are beset with gnats; and boys make their sleeping companion start up, with playing a burning glass on his hand; and blacksmiths are super carbonated; and cobblers in their stalls almost feel a wish to be transplanted; and butter is too easy to spread; and the dragoons wonder whether the Romans liked their helmets; and old ladies, with their lappets unpinned, walk along in a state of dilapidation; and the servant maids are afraid they look vulgarly hot; and the author who has a plate of strawberries brought him finds that he has come to the end of his writing.—*Leigh Hunt.*

THE EARLY DAYS AND FEELINGS OF EBENEZER ELLIOTT.

It would seem that my poetical propensities are traceable to certain incidents; but that about the end of my fourteenth year my mind began to make efforts for itself. Those efforts, however, were favored by an accident of importance in the history of my education. A clergyman called Firth, who held a poor curatcy at a desolate place called Middlesmoor, bequeathed to my father his library, containing, besides scores of Greek and Latin books, Barrow's "Sermons," Ray's "Wisdom of God," Derham's "Physico-Theology," Young's "Night Thoughts," Hervey's "Meditations," Henepin's "Travels," and three volumes of the "Royal Magazine," embellished with views of Bombay, Madras, the Falls of Niagara, Pope's Villa at Twickenham, and fine colored representations of foreign birds. My writings owe something to all these books; particularly to Henepin, who carried me with him from Niagara to the Mississippi. I was never weary of Barrow; he and Young taught me to condense. Ray also was a favorite. The picture of Pope's villa induced me to buy his "Essay on Man," but could not enable me to like it. In the "Royal Magazine" I found the narrative of a shipwreck on a South-Sea Island; on which I made a romance in blank verse, twenty years before Scott printed his "Lady of the Last Minstrel." My next treasure was Shenstone; I could repeat all the mottoes, translated from the Greek and Latin, which he has prefixed to his poems. I think he is now undervalued. Then followed Milton, who held me captive long.

I have said I always took the shortest road to an object; this tendency led me into some errors, but is the principal cause of my ultimate success as an author. I never could read a feeble book through: it follows that I read master-pieces only—the best thoughts of the highest minds; after Milton, Shakspeare—then Ossian, then Junius—with my father's Jacobinism for a commentary—Paine's "Common Sense," Swift's "Tale of a Tub," "Joan of Arc," Schiller's "Robbers," Burger's "Leonora," Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," and, long afterwards, Tasso, Dante, De Stael, Schlegel, Hazlitt and the "Westminster Review." But I have a strange memory. Sometimes it fails me altogether; yet when I was twelve years old, I almost knew the Bible by heart, and in my sixteenth year I could repeat, without missing a word, the first, second and sixth books of "Paradise Lost!"

If, then, I possess that power which is called genius, how great must be my moral demerits!—for what have I written that will bear any comparison with the least of my glorious models? But I possess not that glorious power. Time has developed in me, not genius, but powers which exist in all men and lie dormant in most. I cannot, like Byron and Montgomery, pour poetry from my heart as from an unfailing fountain; and of my inability to identify myself, like Shakspeare and Scott, with the characters of other men; my abortive "Kerhonah," "Taurassdes," and similar rejected failures, are melancholy instances. My thoughts are all exterior; my mind is the mind of my own eyes. A primrose is to me a primrose and nothing more: I love it because it is nothing more. There is not in my writings one good idea that has not been suggested to me by some real occurrence, or by some object actually before my eyes, or by some remembered object or occurrence, or by the thoughts of other men